DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 300 280 SO 018 176

AUTHOR O'Brien, J. Stephen
TITLE Mixed Messages: What Bishops & Priests Say about Catholic Schools.
INSTITUTION National Catholic Educational Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 154p.
PUB TYPE Books (010) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Historical Materials (060)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Catholic Educators; *Catholic Schools; *Clergy; History; Religious Education
IDENTIFIERS *Roman Catholic Church

ABSTRACT

The history of the Catholic Church and its schools in the United States is primarily a history of bishops' and priests' actions. Chapter 1 describes this history in terms of Catholic schools: (1) prior to the Constitutional convention; (2) during controversial periods from 1885-1917; (3) in U.S. society from 1918-1964; and (4) relationships to U.S. Supreme Court decisions. Chapter 2 discusses this Church's authority structure. Chapters 3 through 9 contain the results of a research study designed to investigate the perceptions of Roman Catholic bishops and priests in terms of how they: (1) valued Catholic schools as part of the Church's work; (2) viewed the schools' effectiveness; (3) evaluated parish catechetical programs; (4) viewed current Catholic school financing methods; (5) perceived the concepts of regionalism and/or consolidation and centralization of Catholic schools; and (6) viewed a potential increase in parental decision-making roles in these schools. Appendices provide: (1) the research methodology; (2) questionnaires and letters; and (3) 43 tables. Fifty references and a list of 22 cases are also included. (JHP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED300280

MIXED MESSAGES

What Bishops & Priests Say About Catholic Schools

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Kokus

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by
J. Stephen O'Brien

published by

National Catholic
Educational Association

BD 018 176

MIXED MESSAGES

What Bishops & Priests Say About Catholic Schools

by
J. Stephen O'Brien

published by

National Catholic
Educational Association
1077 30th Street, N.W. Suite 100
Washington, D.C. 20007-3852
(202) 337-6232
© 1987

The contents of this book are the opinions of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Catholic Educational Association.

Table of Contents

PREFACE *VII*

CHAPTER 1
BISHOPS, PRIESTS AND THE HISTORY OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS
Introduction *1*
Catholic Schools before the Nation *3*
Early Schools
Catholic Schools and the Young Nation *5*
The Church and Society 1789-1884
Nativism and the Bishops
The Plenary Councils of Baltimore
Catholic Schools and Controversy *18*
The Social Setting 1885-1917
The New Immigrants
Bishop against Bishop
Americanism
The Rapid Growth of Catholic Schools
Catholic Schools Come of Age *30*
American Society 1918-1964
The Continued Growth of Catholic Schools
Catholic Schools and the Supreme Court
Vatican Council II
Catholic Schools After Vatican II *37*
Catholic Schools and the Supreme Court Continued
Catholic Schools in Decline

CHAPTER 2
THE AUTHORITY STRUCTURE OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH
Background *49*
The Structure of the Church *49*

CHAPTER 3
PROFILE OF UNITED STATES BISHOPS AND PRIESTS
Purpose of the Study 53
Background Data 54

CHAPTER 4
THE VALUE OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS
Value of Catholic Schools 59
Overall Need for the Existence of Catholic Schools as Alternative Schools 59
Potential Role of Catholic Schools in Preparing Students for Today's Church and Society 61

CHAPTER 5
THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS
Quality of Education Programs in Catholic Schools 67
Effectiveness of Formation Programs in the Lives of Students 70
Potential of Religious Education Programs (CCD) for Adequate Formation of Students 72

CHAPTER 6
FUNDING PRACTICES FOR CATHOLIC SCHOOLS
Perceptions of Present Financial Practices 78
Future Financial Expectations 83
Judgment on Relationships between Tuition and School Selection 87

CHAPTER 7
FUTURE STRUCTURES OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS
Alternative Non-school Models 89
Alternative Structures for Schools 92
Regionalization and Centralization of Schools 94
Staffing and Authority Issues 96

CHAPTER 8
UNITY AND DIVERSITY
High Agreement Among Bishops and Priests 99
Low Agreement 101
Divergence 103
Other Variables 104

CHAPTER 9
CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS
Religious Education Outside of Schools *107*
New Catholic Schools *109*
Possible Actions *110*
Summary *111*

APPENDICES
Appendix A—Research Methodology *115*
Appendix B—Questionnaires and Letters *117*
Appendix C—Tables *123*

REFERENCES *145*

TABLE OF CASES *147*

VITA *149*

Preface

Not everyone will be happy with the data or the conclusions in this book. The data indicate very positive perceptions by both bishops and priests toward Catholic schools and a lack of confidence in religious education programs outside of schools. Some may rejoice in the good news for schools, but their joy will be tempered by the knowledge that the perceptions are not always matched by actions.

Some will not be happy because the book repeats Greeley's disclosure of the results of a suppressed study on religious education. It was a major study and unfortunately it was negative. Perhaps by calling attention to the need for further research in religious education someone may be motivated to produce new data. My hope is that whatever truth there is in this book will further the church's educational mission.

In order to assist the reader, some sections of chapters 3 through 7 not related to all of the bishops and priests have been placed in a screen. Readers who are only interested in major findings may skip the screened sections.

I would like to thank publically the people who made this study possible: the bishops and priests who responded to the questionnaire; the National Catholic Educational Association for funding the study; Rev. Msgr. John F. Meyers for supporting the project from the beginning; Rev. Eugene P. Sullivan for suggesting the study and for the use of his questionnaire; Most Rev. John R. Roach for encouraging bishops to answer the questionnaire; Margaret McBrien, RSM, Robert Kealey, FSC, Lourdes Sheehan, RSM, Helen Jean Kormelink, OSB, Wayne Smith for insightful help with the manuscript; Mary V. Barnes for helping with data input and typing the manuscript; Mary M. O'Brien, Jeanette O'Brien, Monique Fouant for hours of proofing data; Dr. Kenneth E. Underwood, Dr. Thomas C. Hunt, Dr. Joan Curcio, Dr. Ronald McKeen, Dr. Larry J. Weber, Dr. Dennis E. Hinkle, Dr. Richard G. Salmon of Virginia Tech for their gracious assistance; Rev. Harold E. Buetow for permission to quote extensively from his history of Catholic schools; Mary Bender for assistance with the statistics.

Stephen O'Brien
February, 1987

CHAPTER 1

Bishops, Priests and the History of Catholic Schools

INTRODUCTION

From the beginning of the republic, Roman Catholic bishops and priests have been instrumental in the founding and support of Catholic schools. The official statements of American bishops have always acknowledged the legitimate place of schools in the educational mission of the church. In 1884 the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore decreed that a parochial school should be erected in every parish in the nation unless the local bishop thought it was impossible.

More recent statements by the United States bishops have also emphasized the importance of schools in the church's educational ministry. In their 1972 pastoral letter, *To Teach as Jesus Did*, they wrote that "Catholic schools which realize the threefold purpose of Christian education, to teach doctrine, to build community and to serve, are the most effective means available to the Church for the education of children and young people" (*To Teach*, 1972, #101). In 1976 they repeated that same statement and added, "Four years ago we reaffirmed our commitment to Catholic schools; we now do so again" (*Teach Them*, 1976, p. 3).

The history of the Catholic church in the United States is for the most part a history of the actions of bishops and priests. Although other people, both religious and lay, helped establish the church in this country, the clergy always held the authority and the power. There is no doubt that women religious worked tirelessly in

parish schools, usually for little or no compensation. Yet it was the pastor who was in fact if not in title the local superintendent of schools and who did more or less what he wanted with the school.

Dolan (1985) described the status of women religious in the nineteenth century church as no more than "Catholic serfs" who had fewer rights and privileges than even lay people.

> Bishops possessed the ultimate authority and frequently sought to interfere in the internal affairs of the community. Some pastors treated them worse than hired help: refusing to honor contract agreements, providing poor living accommodations, and removing them from the schools. . . . Obviously all bishops and pastors did not act in this manner, but those that did were so numerous that this aspect of American Catholic history would constitute a book in itself (p. 289).

There is story after story about how bishops and priests controlled religious communities of women. One very effective method was for bishops to constitute religious communities as diocesan which put the sisters directly under the bishop's authority. Regardless of the type of constitution the religious community had, problems arose when bishops disagreed with community superiors. A common problem was over the kinds of work the sisters should be doing. When one superior tried to withdraw the sisters from household work at the seminary to train them for teaching, she ran into opposition from the local bishop who wanted them to cook and clean for seminarians. Some bishops actually ran communities themselves, usually with disastrous results. (Ewens, 1978, pp. 285-286).

As the schools became more complicated and the pace of church life became more demanding, in the twentieth century bishops and priests left much of the day-to-day running of the schools to the increasingly professional sisters. They did not, however, lose their control. At the same time, sisters' compensation continued to be inadequate for the many needs of the religious communities. One symptom was a report that the nation's 115,000 sisters are having a crisis over retirement funds and that it will take a two billion dollar fund to meet their financial needs. Much of the problem stemmed from the low pay sisters have received for their work, especially teaching. One sister was quoted as saying that when she started teaching in the 1950s she received 50 dollars per month and no benefits (Fialka, 1986, p. 1).

Bishops and priests continue to have the authority and power in the church in law and in fact. The church has become more consultative since Vatican Council II, but the final authority rests with the clergy. It is important, therefore, to look at the history of Catholic schools from the perspective of how the bishops and priests dealt with them.

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS BEFORE THE NATION

Early Schools

The earliest Catholic schools in the new world were part of the Spanish missionary activity to the Indians. Under a plan devised in 1516, each village in New Spain would have a church and a school. This ideal was put into effect with varying degrees of success throughout what is now Florida, Texas, Arizona and California. The French made similar efforts in what is now Canada. In both cases, the purpose of the endeavors was to convert the Indians to Christianity. Although the Spanish were more successful at least initially, neither they nor the French were able to convert large numbers of Indians (Buetow, 1970, pp. 3, 14).

One very early Franciscan school was the "classical school and preparatory seminary at St. Augustine" for Spanish children. Records indicate that the school existed in 1606 and was still functioning in 1753. As with other schools of the time, the purpose was "to teach the children Christian doctrine, reading and writing" (Buetow, 1970, p. 5).

Under French rule in 1722, two Capuchin monks started a parish school for boys in New Orleans, a small town of 300 people, three houses, and one warehouse. Five years later, 10 Ursuline sisters from France opened Ursuline Academy. It had a boarding school for the upper classes and a day school that was open to all white children. They also provided religious instruction to Negro and Indian children (Burns, 1912, pp. 67-71).

In the English colonies, Roman Catholics were a true minority. Catholics numbered less than one-half of the 300 colonists who settled in Maryland in 1634. As late as 1708, Catholics numbered less than 3,000 (nine percent) in a population of almost 34,000. Pennsylvania was only the other English colony that had any concentration of Catholics. Yet in 1757 Catholics numbered only 1,365 (less than one percent) out of a total population of 200,000 (Buetow, 1969, p. 21).

Like other religious groups, Catholics came to the new world to practice their religious beliefs in freedom. Before the colonists set sail in 1633, Cecilius Calvert, the second Baron of Baltimore, issued a set of instructions for the new colonists. He urged that religion be practiced on board ship and in the new colony as privately as possible and that Protestants be treated mildly and justly. Although the Protestants in Maryland continued to treat the Catholics with suspicion, on the recommendation of Baron Baltimore the Maryland assembly passed the 1649 Act of Toleration. It read in part:

> And whereas the inforceing of the conscience in matters of Religion hath frequently fallen out to be of dangerous Consequence in those commonwealthes where it hath been practised . . . Be it Therefore . . . enacted . . . that noe person or psons whatsoever within this Province . . . professing to believe in Jesus Christ, shall from henceforth bee any waies troubled, Molested or discountenanced for or in respect of his or her religion nor in the free exercise thereof" (Ellis, 1969, p. 26).

Unfortunately, the Act of Toleration did not long survive. Under Maryland's first Puritan governor, the assembly repealed it in 1654 and outlawed Catholics. Until after the revolution, Catholics in Maryland were forbidden to run schools, have public religious services or hold political office (Hughes, 1969, p. 27).

The first Catholic school in Maryland was established in 1640 by a former Jesuit novice, Ralph Crouch, at Newtown Manor. The school accepted Catholics and Protestants alike and was financed by endowments of local Catholics. Perhaps, the most famous was a Catholic farmer named Edward Cotton who in 1653 left his herd of cattle to the school. Newtown Manor school was closed under the penal laws of Maryland in 1688 (Ellis, 1912, pp. 95-97, 105). In 1745, the Jesuits opened a school at Bohemia Manor, an isolated section of northeast Maryland. Although little is known of its history, among its students were some famous Catholics, John Carroll, the first bishop of Baltimore, his cousin Charles, a future signor of the Declaration of Independence and Leonard Neale, the second archbishop of Baltimore. This school's reputed connection with Georgetown University seems to be limited to John Carroll's having been a student at Bohemia Manor and the founder of Georgetown (Buetow, 1970, p. 30).

It is difficult to say when the first Catholic schools were founded in Pennsylvania. Although Philadelphia in 1750 was the largest city in the English colonies with a population of 18,000, its

Catholic population numbered approximately 400. The entire colony of Pennsylvania had less than 1,400 Catholics. Popular history records that in Pennsylvania Catholic priests founded schools at the same time they founded parishes, but much of the evidence is indirect. Anglican parson Richard Backhouse wrote to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in England:

> They did what none but Quakers dare do, in a country under government of a Protestant king; that is, they engaged by their great encouragement a rigid, virulent Papist to set up school in the said town of Chester, in order to oppose and impoverish the said Protestant teacher. Under such proceedings we meekly and seriously debated the matter with him. . . . Yet, notwithstanding they did, and still persist to encourage the same. Nay, they carried their implacable malice so far as to occasion by threats and promises most of the children who under the said Protestant teacher's tuition to be taken from him without being able to give any reason for such their proceedings (Burns, 1912b, pp. 120-121).

Whatever the case, Catholics shared with their Protestant neighbors the belief that the primary purpose of the school was for religious instruction and that any academic teaching was of secondary importance (Buetow, 1970, p. 34).

The first parish school in Philadelphia was established by Saint Mary's church in 1782 under the direction of Father Robert Molyneaux. Financed by auctioning seats in church to the wealthy Catholics of Philadelphia, this school was to be one "'where the young might be instructed in their religion and receive a secular education as well.'" It had an upper and lower school with the board of eight managers presided over by the pastor who had absolute power over the school (Buetow, 1970, p. 35-36). Contrary to the usual practice of having the students bring their own textbooks to school, Father Molyneaux had a special primer printed with a catechism attached (Burns, 1912, p. 134).

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS AND THE YOUNG NATION

The Church and Society 1789-1884

The first federal census of 1790 listed 3,929,214 citizens of the United States. Approximately 35,000 of those or less than one percent were Catholic. Most of the Catholics lived in the middle Atlantic states and in the French settlements of the western territory (Ellis, 1969, p. 43). In 1789, the Jesuit John Carroll became the first

Catholic bishop in the United States. Carroll was a friend of Benjamin Franklin and with his cousin Charles had accompanied Franklin before the revolution to persuade the Canadians to remain neutral during the conflict with England. Carroll's appointment came at an auspicious time. George Washington had recently written to a group of prominent American Catholics stating:

> And I presume that your fellow-citizens will not forget the patriotic part which you took in the accomplishment of their Revolution, and the establishment of their government; nor the important assistance which they received from a nation in which the Roman Catholic religion is professed (Ellis, 1969, pp. 39-40).

In 1792, Carroll addressed his first pastoral letter to the Catholics of the United States on the subject of education. After expressing his disappointment that he could not visit each area of his vast diocese personally, he wrote:

> Knowing, therefore, that the principles instilled in the course of a Christian education, are generally preserved through life, and that *a young man according to his way, even when he is old, he will not depart from it* (Proverbs 21:6), I have considered the virtuous and Christian instructions of youth as a principal object of pastoral solicitude. Now who can contribute so much to lighten this burden, which weighs so heavy on the shoulders of the pastors of souls and who can have so great an interest and special duty in the forming of youthful minds to habits of virtue and religion, as their parents themselves? Especially while their children retain their native docility, and their hearts are uncorrupted by vice (Nolan, 1984, pp. 16-17).

Granted that much of the letter was aimed at promoting the newly established Georgetown College, Carroll's emphasis on education is an adequate reflection of the church at that time. St. Mary's College, Baltimore, founded in 1803 and Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, founded in 1808 would closely follow the establishment of Georgetown (Buetow, 1970, pp. 53, 57).

After the turn of the century, the founding of native American religious communities of women provided a substantial basis for the future of Catholic schools in the United States. In 1808, Elizabeth Bayley Seton founded the Sisters of Charity in Emmitsburg, Maryland, and established a free school for 20 students there in 1809. In 1812, under Bishop Flaget, two more communities established themselves in Kentucky, the Sisters of Loretto, and the Sisters of

Charity of Nazareth, an off-shoot of Elizabeth Seton's group (Ellis, 1969, pp. 55-56).

One group of sisters, the Ursulines in New Orleans, were fearful that their incorporation into the new republic as a part of the Louisiana Purchase would lead to the loss of their property and school. The superior wrote to President Jefferson in 1804 asking him for protection for their institution. He replied:

> The President of the United States to Soeur Therese de St. Xavier Farjou, Superieure, and the Nuns, etc.
>
> I have received, Holy Sisters, the letters you have written to me, wherein you express anxiety for the property vested in your institution by the former Government of Louisiana. The principles of the Government and Constitution of the United States are a sure guarantee to you that it will be preserved to you sacred and inviolate, and that your institution will be permitted to govern itself according to its own voluntary rules, without interference from the civil authority. Whatever diversity or shade may appear in the religious opinions of our fellow-citizens, the charitable objects of your institution can not be indifferent to any; and its furtherance of the wholesome purposes of society by training up its young members in the way they should go, can not fail to insure it the patronage of the Government it is under. Be assured it will meet with all the protection my office can give it.
>
> I salute you, Holy Sisters, with friendship and respect (Burns, 1912a, p. 82-83).

Bishops around the new country began establishing schools wherever possible. Boston became a diocese in 1812; the first school was established by the Ursuline Sisters in 1820. It was destroyed by the Protestants in 1834 (Buetow, 1970, pp. 84-85). The first Catholic church in New York City established a free school in 1805. In 1806 it had 200 students and was subsidized in part by state funds. By 1828, there was several Catholic schools for both boys and girls throughout the city (Buetow, pp. 87-88). Schools were also formed in Charleston, South Carolina soon after its establishment as a diocese under John England. His Charleston seminary, a school for Catholics and non-Catholics alike, stayed open until 1836 (Buetow, 1970, pp. 95-96). Catholic schools during this period were little different from their Protestant counterparts, except that they taught Catholic religious beliefs (Ellis, 1969, p. 56).

The main objectives of Catholic schools, both for boys and girls, continued to be moral education. By 1829 there were 20 aca-

demies for boys and 15 academies for girls in the United States and religious communities operated over 75 percent of them. Although it is impossible to speak with any certainty concerning their curriculum, the girls' schools focused on practical matters while the boys' had a more classical curriculum. The tuition fees were high, although some provisions were made for the poor. Capital funding came from the Propagation of the Faith and from the Austrian Leopoldine Association for aiding missions (Goebel, 1937, pp. 109-110).

Public education also underwent significant changes. Under strong leadership from many sections of the nation, the notion of free, non-sectarian education was beginning to be accepted. Non-sectarian, of course, meant Protestant, since the King James Bible and the Protestant ethic were still important parts of the school. Elementary schools were being influenced by the theories of Pestalozzi and Froebel, and after the Civil War compulsory school attendance laws became more common. Also after the Civil War, the high school began to emerge from the academies, although it was not until the 1880s that public secondary school enrollment surpassed that of nongovernmental schools. Only a small percentage of students ever graduated from high school, two percent of the population aged 17 in 1870; yet more and more communities were using tax funds for their support (Tyack, 1974, pp. 56-57).

While Protestants were accepting the common school ideal, Catholics were opting for separate schools. The success of the Catholic school system was made possible by four distinct developments: (1) the willingness of foreign religious communities to teach in the schools at subsistence wages which made it practical for generally poor Catholics to provide schooling; (2) the influx of non-English speaking Catholics, for example, the Germans, which made the church support ethnic cultural values; (3) a fear on the part of the church's leaders that American "godlessness" affected the American culture; and (4) the unwillingness of public school leaders to make the necessary compromises that would have allowed Catholic children to attend public schools (Lazerson 1977, pp. 298-299).

For the nation, this period was one of transition. It was a time of massive economic growth where the country went from a dependence on cottage industry to wide-spread industrialization. No longer could America be called an agricultural country, since it was on the road to international industrial expansion. The north was more industrial than the south; machines were run by women and children who worked long hours for low wages under generally un-

safe conditions. Labor unions grew out of the need for workers to have some say in their own lives.

One of the more far-reaching social changes to affect the American Catholic church was the immigration from Europe. During the Irish potato famine, immigration from that country reached astounding proportions. In 1846, there were 92,484 immigrants; in 1847, 196,224; in 1848, 173,174; in 1849, 204,771; in 1850, 206,041. The federal census of 1850 listed over 960,000 Irish in the United States. By 1860, the total had risen to over 1.6 million with most of the immigrants settling in New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Illinois, Ohio and New Jersey. Most of the Irish immigrants were Catholics and in spite of their agricultural backgrounds tended to settle in cities. Because of their low skills, they held the lowest paying jobs.

The Germans came later and in slightly smaller numbers. Between 1865 and 1900, approximately 700,000 German immigrants came to the United States. The Germans tended to settle in the farmlands of the Ohio river basin and in the prairies west of the Mississippi. Americans were more favorable toward the German immigrants than toward the Irish who were generally viewed as lazy. The Germans kept their native language, established national parishes and set up German-speaking schools (Buetow, 1970, pp. 112-114).

Nativism and the Bishops

The Protestant majority in the United States viewed with alarm the large numbers of Catholic immigrants. Traditional hostility toward Catholics and toward foreigners produced a series of native American parties that flourished during the 1840s and 1850s. Ellis (1969) summarized:

> It was symptomatic of the intrenched bias against Catholics, that in the month before the First Plenary Council convened, the secret order of the Star-Spangled Banner passed into the hands of an expert new management that won for it a significant showing in the municipal elections of 1852. Two years later a national organization had emerged and the Know-Nothing party, as it came to be called, was from that time to the Civil War a force which no Catholic or foreign-born citizen could afford to ignore. It is a dreary tale which we need not enter upon in detail, but it is important to remember that as a result of the ceaseless outpouring of books, pamphlets, and newspapers from sources of this kind the minds of thousands of Americans were irrevocably fixed in

> the traditional dislike of Catholicism which had been part of their intellectual heritage. Mark Twain testified to what this influence had meant to him during his youth in Missouri. Because he had grown up in an atmosphere where Samuel F.B. Morse's *Foreign Conspiracy* and similar tracts were read as gospel truth, it was not surprising that Twain should later say, "I have been educated to enmity toward everything that is Catholic, and sometimes, in consequence of this, I find it much easier to discover Catholic faults than Catholic merits" (pp. 84-85).

In 1855, Abraham Lincoln firmly declared that he was not a Know-Nothing, the popular name for the nativist party, when he said:

> How could I be? How can any one who abhors the oppression of negroes, be in favor of degrading classes of white people? As a nation, we began by declaring that "*all men are created equal.*" We now practically read it, "all men are created equal, *except negroes.*" When the Know-Nothings get control, it will read, "all men are created equal, except negroes, *and foreigners, and catholics*" (Ellis, 1969, p. 86).

No one knows what individual Catholics might have suffered from the anti-Catholic sentiment. Of the hundreds of local nativist societies scattered throughout the country, many of them were openly connected with local Protestant churches. However, there are some examples of how the Catholic church suffered institutionally because of their activities. In 1842, Bishop Francis Kenrick of Philadelphia requested that the city help protect Catholic children from being compelled to use the King James Bible in the public schools. Out of that controversy came the American Protestant Association which declared that Catholicism was "subversive of civil and religious liberty." The 94 Protestant ministers who founded the organization said they were uniting to defend Protestantism against the Catholic church (Ellis, 1969, p. 64).

In 1834, a mob burned the Ursuline Sisters convent at Charlestown, Massachusetts; in 1844 in Philadelphia, rioters burned two Catholic churches and caused the deaths of 13 people. A flood of pamphlets and the publication of such books as the *Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk* incited many people to anti-Catholic sentiments. It took the Civil War to bring an end to this phase of anti-Catholicism in the United States. It would not arise again until near the end of the century with the advent of the American Protective Association (Ellis, 1969, pp. 61-66, 86-87).

The Catholic bishops of the United States responded collectively and individually to the social, cultural and economic changes taking place in the country in different ways. Between 1829 and 1852, the bishops held seven provincial councils in Baltimore (a meeting of the bishops of a particular geographical region). At the first council, the bishops were concerned about children of the poor and framed the following instruction:

> Since it is evident that very many of the young, the children of Catholic parents, especially the poor, have been exposed and are still exposed, in many places of this Province, to great danger of the loss of faith or the corruption of morals, on account of the lack of such teachers as could safely be entrusted with so great an office, we judge it absolutely necessary that schools be established, in which the young may be taught the principles of faith and morality, while being instructed in letters (Burns, 1912a, p. 182).

In 1833 the Second Provincial Council of Baltimore appointed a standing committee to oversee the development of approved textbooks for Catholic schools. The decree was, however, more in the ideal than in the real and was never implemented. The only other provincial council with any important legislation regarding schools was the fourth. Held in 1840, the bishops admonished pastors to do everything they could to protect Catholic students in the public schools from being made to join in Protestant prayers, hymns and bible reading (Burns, 1912a, pp. 182-183).

The 1843 pastoral letter following the Fourth Provincial Council repeated the bishops' earlier warning about Catholic students in public schools:

> We have seen with serious alarm, efforts made to poison the fountains of public education, by giving it a sectarian hue, and accustoming children to the use of a version of Bible made under sectarian bias, and placing in their hands books of various kinds replete with offensive and dangerous matter. This is plainly opposed to the free genius of our civil institutions. We admonish parents of the awful account they must give at the divine tribunal, should their children, by their neglect or connivance, be imbued with false principles, and led away from the path of salvation. Parents are strictly bound, like faithful Abraham, to teach their children the truths which God has revealed; and if they suffer them to be led astray, the souls of the children will be required at their hands. Let them, therefore, avail themselves of their natural

> rights, guaranteed by the laws, and see that no interference with the faith of their children be used in the public schools, and no attempt made to induce conformity in any thing contrary to the laws of Catholic Church . . . (Nolan, 1984, pp. 141-142).

Individual bishops had responded to the problem in a variety of ways. In the Diocese of Philadelphia, factional problems at St. Mary's Church kept educational advances at a standstill for 20 years after the diocese had been erected in 1808. Only with the arrival in 1830 of Francis Kenrick as administrator was there any move to establish Catholic schools in the city. Along with his secretary, John Hughes, the future bishop of New York, Kenrick worked diligently to establish free schools (Burns, 1912b, pp. 260-261). By 1850, the year before his death, Kenrick had established a Catholic school in almost every parish in the Diocese of Philadelphia (Buetow, 1970, p. 136).

John Hughes was the archbishop in New York from 1838 until 1864. There was a tradition in that city that public monies went to support Catholic schools. In 1806, St. Peter School was receiving funds from the state. In 1820, a portion of monies collected for support of the common schools was given to the Roman Catholic Benevolence Society. Other denominational schools in New York also received public monies. In 1824, the public school society arranged that the grants to denominational schools be stopped with the exception of orphan asylumns. Catholic schools received no money, but the nonsectarian Protestant schools did. This action was the seed for the New York school controversy.

The occasion of the controversy was Governor Seward's message to the New York legislature in 1840. The governor recommended that the children of immigrants be allowed to go to schools where they would be instructed by teachers who spoke their language and were of the same religious faith. Seward's speech prompted Catholics to petition the Common Council of New York City for monies from the common school fund to run the eight Catholic schools operated by the eight parishes in New York City.

After many meetings and several public debates, the Common Council of New York turned down the Catholics' petition in January 1841. Hughes then carried the debate to the New York legislature. The kinds of arguments used can be seen from an address delivered by Bishop Hughes to a group of Catholics in preparation for lobbying at the state legislature:

> It is asked, "What system would be deemed just by the Catholics?" I answer, any system that will leave the various denominations each in full possession of its religious rights over the minds of its own children. If the children are to be educated promiscuously as at present, let religion in every shape and form be excluded. Let not the Protestant version of the Scriptures, Protestant forms of prayers, Protestant hymns, be forced on the children of Catholics, Jews, and others, as at present, in schools for the support of which their parents pay taxes as well as Presbyterians (Burns, 1912b, p. 372).

In 1842, the legislature solved the question by extending the common school to the city of New York. Thus, no religious group was to receive money from the common school fund. Hughes acknowledged that he had been beaten in his attempt to get public monies for Catholic schools. He was also convinced that attendance of Catholic children at public schools was a danger to their faith. Compromise at this point was out of the question; the only thing for Catholics to do was to establish their own school system. Hughes' educational principle was "let parochial schools be established and maintained everywhere." To each new pastor he appointed, he said "You must proceed upon the principle, that in this age and country, the school is before the church" (Burns, 1912b, pp. 362- 375).

When Bishop Benedict Fenwick came to Boston in 1825, his first concern was the establishment of elementary schools. In the traditionally anti-Catholic, puritan atmosphere of Boston it was important for Catholic children to be educated in their own faith. In 1831 in nearby Lowell, the town council decided to appropriate money for a separate school district for Catholics. At this time in Massachusetts all schools were denominational. The plan continued until 1852 when a new school was opened at St. Patrick's with a hope of public support for that school as well. The town refused, however, to provide monies for St. Patrick's and withdrew financial aid from all Catholic schools in Lowell. The Lowell Plan had offered the possibility of compromise between the Catholics and the common school system. It was one more experiment that did not succeed (Burns, 1912b, pp. 282-289).

Perhaps it was failures like this that kept New England's hierarchy from giving the strong leadership necessary establishing parish schools. By the turn of the century, no more than 40 percent of Boston's parishes had schools; most other New England dioceses

could not even approach that percentage. What schools there were came from local parish initiatives, not from strong encouragement from bishops (Dolan, 1985, p. 264).

Catholics in Savannah, Georgia took another approach, one that was unique for the period. Up until the 1850s, Savannah was a part of the Diocese of Charleston, South Carolina. Irish immigrants moved into Georgia beginning in the 1830s. When the Sisters of Mercy arrived in 1845 to work in the schools, Catholic laymen had already established six schools in the diocese which they supported by solliciting money door to door. (Buetow, 1970, p. 145).

The Plenary Councils of Baltimore

The three Plenary Councils of Baltimore (involving all of the bishops of the United States) were held in 1852, 1866 and 1884. Each council had a progressively stronger message for Roman Catholics regarding education.

In their pastoral letter issued after the First Plenary Council, the bishops said:

> Encourage the establishment and support of Catholic schools; make every sacrifice which may be necessary for this object: spare our hearts the pain of beholding the youth whom, after the example of our Master, we so much love, involved in all the evils of an uncatholic education, evils too multiplied and too obvious to require that we should do more than raise our voices in solemn protest against the system from which they spring (Nolan, 1984, p. 180).

This council left little doubt that the bishops had cast their lot with the school as the primary way to educate Catholics in the United States. Although some bishops still hoped to change the emerging common school, others only saw hope in the parochial school, a school funded at least in part by public monies (Meiring, 1978, p. 149).

When the Second Plenary Council convened one year after the Civil War, there were 45 bishops present. Fourteen of them were born in the United States, 11 in Ireland, 10 in France, three in Canada, three in Spain and one each in Austria, Belgium, Germany and Switzerland. The 33 percent native-born represented the diverse national backgrounds found among Catholics in the United States at the time (Ellis, 1969, p. 89). The council needed to address the societal problems brought on by the Civil War and the rapid in-

crease of industrialization. In the decrees of the council, the bishops wrote:

> The best, nay the only remedy that remains, in order to meet these very grave evils seems to lie in this, that in every diocese schools—each close to the Church—should be erected, in which the Catholic youth may be instructed in letters and the noble arts as well as in religion and sound morals (Buetow, 1970, p. 149).

In their pastoral letter, the bishops also declared:

> We recur to the subject of the education of youth, to which, in the former plenary council, we already directed your attention, for the purpose of reiterating the admonition we then gave, in regard to the establishment and support of parochial schools; and of renewing the expression of our conviction, that religious teaching and religious training should form part of every system of school education (Nolan, 1984, p. 180).

The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore convened in 1884, but two events occurred in 1875 that had a major effect on that council. The first was a speech to the Army of Tennessee by President Grant. In 1865, James G. Blaine had introduced a bill into the House of Representatives at Grant's request which would have prohibited federal aid to any sectarian institution. In his 1875 speech, Grant said:

> Encourage free schools and resolve that not one dollar appropriated for their support shall be appropriated to the support of any sectarian schools. Resolve that neither the state nor the nation, nor both combined, shall support institutions of learning other than those sufficient to afford every child growing up in the land of opportunity of a good common school education, unmixed with sectarian, pagan, or atheistical dogmas. Leave the matter of religion to the family altar, the church, and the private schools, supported entirely by private contributions. Keep the church and state forever separate (Buetow, 1970, p. 157).

In his annual message to congress, Grant continued to press for the prohibition of tax money to any religious group. Blaine followed up the address by calling for a constitutional amendment which said in part that "no money raised by taxation in any State for the support of public schools . . . shall ever be made under the control of any religious sect or denomination . . ." (Buetow, 1970, p. 157). While the Blaine amendment was never passed by both houses of the congress, it was incorporated into over half of the

state constitutions written between 1877 and 1970 (Buetow, 1970, p. 158).

The second event of 1875 that had a direct effect on the Third Plenary Council was an instruction from the Roman Congregation of the Progagation of the Faith on non-Catholic schools. The letter speaks for itself:

> 1. The first point to come under consideration was the system of education itself, quite peculiar to those schools. Now, that system seemed to the S. Congregation most dangerous and very much opposed to Catholicity. For the children in those [non-Catholic] schools, the very principles of which exclude all religious instruction, can neither learn the rudiments of the faith nor be taught the precepts of the Church; hence, they will lack that knowledge, of all else, necessary to man without which there is no leading a Christian life. . . .
>
> 2. Again, these schools being under no control of the Church, the teachers are selected from every set indiscriminately; and this, while no proper precaution is taken to prevent them injuring the children, so that there is nothing to stop them from infusing into the young minds the seeds of error and vice. Then evil results are certainly to be dreaded from the fact that in these schools, or at least in the very many of them, children of both sexes must be in the same class and class-room and must sit side by side at the same desk. Every circumstance mentioned goes to show that the children are fearfully exposed to the danger of losing their faith and that their morals are not properly safeguarded.
>
> 3. Unless this danger of perversion can be rendered remote, instead of proximate, such schools cannot in conscience be used. . . .
>
> 4. It only remains, then, for the prelates to use every means in their power to keep the flocks committed to their care from all contact with the public schools. All are agreed that there is nothing so needful to this end as the establishment of Catholic schools in every place—and schools no whit inferior to the public ones (McCluskey, 1964, pp. 122-123).

In the light of these events, the Third Plenary Council issued strong legislation concerning Catholic schools:

> 1. Near every church, when it does not already exist, a parochial school is to be erected within two years from the promulgation of this Council, and to be kept up in the future, unless in the judgment of the Bishop the erection and maintenance of the school is impossible.

> 2. A priest who is gravely negligent in erecting the school within this time or is gravely negligent in its maintenance after it is erected can and must be removed from that church.
>
> 3. The mission or parish which so neglects to aid the priest in erecting or maintaining the schools, that on account of this supine negligence the school cannot exist, is to be reprimanded by the Bishop, and if it shall have been contumacious, it is to be given spiritual punishments.
>
> 4. All Catholic parents are bound to send their children to parochial schools, unless at home or in other Catholic schools they provide sufficiently and fully for the Christian education, or on account of a good reason approved by the Bishop, using meanwhile the necessary precautions and remedies, they are permitted to send them to other schools (Buetow, 1970, p. 152).

These decrees form the basis for the Catholic school system in the United States. Yet each point was debated extensively by the bishops at the council. One key issue was whether or not to deny the sacraments to parents who did not send their children to Catholic school. The bishops opposed to such an extreme sanction won by a mere five votes. They lost, however, on the sanctions aimed at uncooperative pastors (Dolan, 1985, p. 272).

In the pastoral letter from the Third Plenary Council, the bishops wrote about Catholic schools:

> We must multiply them, till every Catholic child in the land shall have within its reach the means of education. There is still much to do ere this be attained. There are still thousands of Catholic children in the United States deprived of the benefit of a Catholic school. Pastors and parents should not rest till this defect be remedied. No parish is complete till it has schools adequate to the needs of its children, and the pastor and people of such a parish should feel that they have not accomplished their entire duty until the want is supplied (Guilday, 1932, p. 248).

The council was also concerned about the quality of existing Catholic schools. They noted that in the past some people had said that it is better to have an imperfect Catholic school than none at all. They wrote: "We must also perfect our schools. We repudiate the idea that the Catholic school need be in any respect inferior to any other school whatsoever" (McCluskey, 1964, p. 93).

To carry out the the decree the bishops called for a board of examiners, examinations for both secular and religious teachers, and school committees in each diocese (Dolan, 1985, pp. 272-273).

Also this council established a commission to prepare a catechism which eventually became known as the Baltimore Catechism, the standard for teaching religion in Catholic elementary schools throughout the United States (Bryce, 1984, pp. 87-95).

In summary, bishops and pastors began setting up parochial schools for three reasons: (1) The schools were seen as an effective way to pass on the faith to the next generation. No other way seemed to offer the same results. (2) The common school was Protestant. Catholic parents did not want their children exposed to Protestant ideology; nor did the bishops. (3) The Catholic schools gave the immigrants a way to preserve their own heritage through religion and language (Dolan, 1985, pp. 276-277).

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS AND CONTROVERSY

The Social Setting 1885-1917

At the turn of the century things were very different than they are today. There were no airplanes, radios, electric refrigerators and few telephones. The average family earned approximately $650 per year with a typical daily wage of $1.50. By the beginning of World War I a plane had flown across the country, an automobile travelled 131.7 miles per hour, the Panama Canal opened and silent movies were all the rage (Buetow, 1970, p. 164-165).

These years were also a time when the authority of the church was not questioned by most American Catholics. The church was clearly a hierarchical society with the pope as the supreme authority. Pope Pius X said that the church was "essentially an unequal society" made up of two categories of people, the pastors and the flock, with the pope as the chief pastor. American bishops shared in this new emphasis on authority and the Third Council of Baltimore had reaffirmed that authority in an undeniable way (Dolan, 1985, p. 222).

The pastor was not to be outdone by the pope or the bishop. Dolan (1985) put it this way:

> Basking in the power of Pope and bishop, the local pastor became a dominant figure in the parish community. [The Pope] was in Rome, the bishop was downtown or in a different city, but the pastor was only a few blocks away; visible in the neighborhood and church, he was the chief authority figure for Catholics. Parish missions reminded people of this when preachers dutifully told

> the people to heed his counsel and be docile parishioners . . . (p. 223).

In such an atmosphere, people learned how to obey as well as pray. To be Catholic meant to worship and obey God through the church and the church meant the pope, bishops, and pastors. Docility and submissiveness were the marks of a good Catholic in imitation of Jesus who suffered on the cross (Dolan, 1985, p. 224).

The New Immigrants

After 1885 the number of immigrants from Germany, Ireland and Great Britain began to decrease markedly. Their places were taken by people from central and southern Europe, mostly from Italy, Russia and Austria-Hungary. An estimate of the Catholic population in 1890 was nine million; by 1920 there were 20 million Catholics in the United States. These large numbers of foreign language immigrants put tremendous pressures on the church to integrate them into American church life (Buetow, 1970, p. 167).

The large numbers of immigrants also placed burdens on cities, where their public schools were called upon to perform the integrating function. As Hunt (1979) commented:

> Industrialization, urbanization and immigration combined to make the America of the early twentieth century a different society than was that of the nineteenth. Citizenship education (sometimes termed "Americanization") occupied a rather prominent place in schooling. Little wonder when one considers that by 1909 57.8 percent of the students in the schools of thirty-seven of the nation's largest cities were either immigrants themselves or the children of immigrants. More than half of the population of the states of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, and Rhode Island were either foreign-born or had one parent with a foreign nativity. The educational problems implicit in the fact that more than one-half of the students who were children of foreign-born fathers from non-English speaking countries lived in homes where English was not spoken are obvious (pp. 355-356).

Immigration also brought with it a new anti-Catholic movement. In 1887, Henry F. Bowers founded the American Protective Association in Clinton, Iowa. While religious hatred existed in the cities, it was strongest in rural America. As Catholics became more powerful and Catholic politicians more prominent, anti-Catholic sentiment increased. The APA arranged for "expriests and nuns" to

tour the country telling their litany of horror stories. People were told and believed that the pope had almost absolute control over the thinking and conduct of Catholics in the United States (Ellis, 1969, pp. 109-110).

In spite of the problems, the new immigrants were rapidly assimilated into the United States. Burns (1912a) lists four reasons for this phenomenon. The first he calls "the new atmosphere of the American life." Any ambitious young person could become successful in any chosen field if he has the education and native ability. Second, the Irish use of their own native English language in Catholic schools helped non-English speakers learn English. Therefore the English Catholic school became the ideal. The third factor was the increase in the number of laws concerning child labor and compulsory school attendance. With compulsory school attendance also came laws that required that children have the ability to read and write English. By 1910, 20 states had such laws.

The fourth factor, and perhaps the most important, was the establishment of foreign language schools themselves. Although somewhat paradoxical, foreign language schools helped the process of assimilation because they allowed for a gradual process of entry into the American mainstream (pp. 295-298). As Cardinal Gibbons, the Archbishop of Baltimore, wrote in 1907:

> Our Catholic schools afford a much easier pathway for the foreigner to enter the American life than is the case in the public school. There the child must enter at once upon the use of the English language—perhaps under the guidance of one who does not know the habits and customs of the immigrant child, and hence cannot enter into complete sympathy with his work. . . . In the Catholic school they come under the instruction of those who know the respective languages and can understand their peculiar idioms of thought and speech. With the English language as a constantly enlarging part of their course, they are gradually, almost unconsciously, brought into complete sympathy with American ideals, and readily adapt themselves to American manners and customs. This assimilation is constantly going on in our Catholic schools, and is quite an important factor in our national development (Burns, 1912b, pp. 298-299).

As important as the native-language schools might have been, they did not last very long. German-speaking immigrants were strongly attached to their language and in 1906 there were over 1.5 million Catholics in the United States who belonged to German-

speaking parishes. Yet, by the turn of the nineteenth century most so-called German Catholic schools were taught completely in English, even in such places as the Archdiocese of Cincinnati. In 1906 there were over one million French-speaking members of Roman Catholic parishes, mostly concentrated in New England. Their schools tended to be bi-lingual, with part of the day taught in French and the larger part taught in English (Burns, 1912b, pp. 299-302).

Italian immigrants during this period did not always find a welcoming nation even within the Catholic church. Up until 1870, Italians were generally accepted; but as more and more entered the United States from southern Italy and Sicily, that acceptance lessened. Italians comprised a large percentage of the Catholic population. By 1920, 4.5 million of the 20 million Catholics were Italian.

Even though many of the people from Italy came from small villages or farms, they tended to settle in large cities where the Catholic church was mostly Irish. It was here that they faced their biggest problems. They found the Catholic church in this country a cold and puritanical organization that was controlled by the Irish. An article by Bernard Lynch in *The Catholic World* in 1888 gave some indication of what they faced. Lynch argued that the Italians were too ignorant to receive the sacraments and would be better off worshiping in basements of Irish churches than in their own Italian speaking churches. Their children should be sent to Irish, English-speaking parish schools where they would come into contact with more sophisticated and presumably helpful Irish-American children. There might be a problem with some of the Irish parents, however, since Italians were "almost of a different civilization" (Iorizzo and Mondello, 1971, p. 183).

Bishops were not in agreement on how best to minister to the Italians. Archbishop Michael Corrigan of New York wanted to establish Italian-speaking parishes, but other American bishops disagreed. Archbishop and later Cardinal Dougherty of Philadelphia closed half of the Italian national parishes in his diocese and worked to Americanize the Italians as quickly as possible. In spite of the hardships, by 1918 there were 26 Italian religious communities working in the United States in schools, hospitals, and immigrant aid societies, not the least among them Francis Xavier Cabrini, the first American citizen saint (Iorizzo and Modello, 1980, pp. 217-229).

Although foreign-language Catholic schools posed few civil problems throughout most of the nation, an 1889 law in Wisconsin

threatened the existence of German-language Catholic and Lutheran schools and non-governmental schools in general. Introduced into the Wisconsin assembly by a Roman Catholic named Michael J. Bennett, the law stated that students be required to attend school within the district of their residence and that certain subjects be taught only in English. The problem with the Bennett law, as far as Catholic schools were concerned, was that parish boundaries did not coincide with the public school district boundaries. Students could comply with the compulsory attendance law only if they attended a parochial school within the public school district in which they lived. The second problem was that in some rural areas, the teachers in Lutheran and Catholic schools did not speak English.

In opposition to the Bennett law, the three bishops of Wisconsin issued a manifesto that stated that the law was unnecessary because the use of the German language in Catholic schools was gradually dying out, offensive because the state was telling Catholic schools how they should be run without contributing to their support, and unjust because it interferred with the rights of parents. The Catholics and Lutherans were joined by the Evangelicals and the Reformed Church in opposition. However, other Protestant groups supported the law, including the Baptists, the Episcopalians, the Congregationalists, the Presbyterians and the Methodists. The controversy came to a head in 1890 in the gubernatorial elections. Governor Hoard, the Republican, was defeated at least partly because of his strong support of the Bennett law. The Wisconsin legislature repealed the law in 1891 (Hunt, 1981, pp. 70-93).

Bishop against Bishop

After the legislation of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore (1884), many dioceses throughout the country made extraordinary efforts to build and finance Catholic schools. Success, however, came slowly. Yet ten years after the council, the national percentage of parishes with schools stood only four percentage points higher than it did at the close of the council, 44 percent compared to 40 (Buetow, 1970, pp. 170-171). All Catholic children were not in Catholic schools and not all American bishops and priests supported the notion of a separate Catholic school system. It was this issue that formed the basis of the first major internal controversy in the American Catholic church (Dolan, 1985, p. 275).

The event that precipitated what has been called the school controversy was an address by Archbishop John Ireland of St. Paul,

Minnesota to the 1890 annual convention of the National Education Association. Previouly Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore and Bishop Keane, rector of the Catholic University of America, had presented papers at the NEA in an attempt to explain the Catholic position on schools. They had said they were not antagonistic to public schools but wanted room made in the curricula for the teaching of religion (Ellis, 1969, pp. 110-111). Archbishop Ireland went further. He was concerned with the possibility of merging the two systems.

He began by granting the state the right to establish schools, advocated compulsory attendance laws, praised the state for offering free education, and said that although he upheld the parish school, he wished that it did not have to be. In speaking of the common school, he said:

> It is our pride and glory. The Republic of the United States has solemnly affirmed its resolve that within its borders no clouds of ignorance shall settle upon the minds of the children of its people. In furnishing the means to accomplish this result its generosity knows no limit. The Free School of America! Withered be the hand raised in sign of its destruction! Can I be suspected of enmity to the state school because I would fain widen the expanse of its wings until all the children of the people find shelter beneath their cover; because I tell of defects which for very love of the state school I seek to remedy? (Reilly, 1944, p. 47).

The Catholic school is necessary, he said, because "the state's school tends to eliminate religion from the minds and hearts of the youth of the country" (Reilly, 1944, p. 48). He then offered two possible solutions that would eliminate the necessity for Catholic schools. The first solution would have been denominational public schools where each religion would have its own schools. Ireland told the NEA:

> I would permeate the regular state school with the religion of the majority of the children of the land, be this religion as Protestant as Protestantism can be, and would, as in done in England, pay for the secular instruction given in denominational schools according to results, that is, every pupil passing the examination before state officials, and in full accordance with the state program, would secure to his school the cost of the tuition of a pupil in the state school. This is not paying for religious instruction, but for the secular instruction demanded by the state, and given to the pupil as thoroughly as he could have received it in the state school (Reilly, 1944, p. 48).

The alternative proposal would have been the implementation of the Poughkeepsie plan that had been in effect for almost 20 years in New York. In essence this plan allowed the public schools to rent Catholic school buildings. Ireland explained:

> In Poughkeepsie the city school board rents the building formerly used as parish schools, and from the hours of 9 A.M. to 3 P.M. the school is in every respect a state school—teachers being engaged and paid by the board, teachers and pupils being examined, state books being used, the door being always open to superintendent and members of the board. There is simply the tacit understanding that so long as the teachers, Catholic in faith, pass their examinations and do their work efficiently and as loyally as those other teachers under control of the board, they shall not be replaced by teachers of another faith. During school hours no religious instruction is given (Reilly, 1944, pp. 48-49).

Catholic response to Archbishop Ireland's speech was swift and heated. His strongest critics were several bishops, among them Bernard J. McQuaid of Rochester, New York, Michael A. Corrigan of New York City and Francis Katzer of Milwaukee. His strongest supporters were Bishop John Keane, rector of The Catholic University, Bishop John Lancaster Spaulding of Louisville and in a quiet but effective way Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore. Although Cardinal Gibbons had written to Dennis O'Connell, rector of the North American College, asking him to acquaint various officials in Rome with the nature of Ireland's talk to ensure that the Archbishop of St. Paul was not hurt by unfavorable reports, his letter was too late. Cardinal Rampolla wrote to Cardinal Gibbons in the name of Pope Leo XIII asking for an opinion of Archbishop Ireland's talk (Reilly, 1944, p. 50).

While this quiet diplomacy was going on through a whole series of letters, newspapers were continuing the controversy. At the same time, the German bishops were involved in the Bennett law fight in Wisconsin. The controversy was further inflamed by the Reverend Thomas J. Bouquillon, a professor of moral theology at the Catholic University. In November 1891, he published a 31-page pamphlet entitled *Education: To Whom Does it Belong?* Bouquillon challenged the traditional teaching of the Catholic church that the state did not have a primary right in education, that this right belonged to the parents. He wrote that education "'belongs to the individual, physical or moral, to the family, to the state, to the Church, to none of these solely and exclusively but to all four combined in harmonious working'" (Buetow, 1970, pp. 171-172).

Within the same month the Reverend Rene I. Holaind, a Jesuit professor of ethics, published a counter-brochure entitled *The Parent First*. Holaind took the more traditional view that education is primarily the right of the church and of parents. The state should only provide education when individuals are not able to do so.

Ireland had put his words into action by establishing the Poughkeepsie plan in two parishes in Faribault and Stillwater, Minnesota. In the midst of the Bouquillon and Holaind pamphlet fight, critics accused Ireland of having inspired Bouquillon's pamphlet to give a basis for his use of the Poughkeepsie plan in his own diocese. Ireland denied that he had inspired the pamphlet and said that it was written at the request of Cardinal Gibbons as a way to end the school controversy (Reilly, 1944, p. 89).

Rome was very much involved in the controversy. Ireland sent his response to the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in April 1892. He denied any prior knowledge of Bouquillon's pamphlet, defended his arrangement with the public schools in Faribault and Stillwater and pointed out his own work for Catholic schools (Reilly, 1944, pp. 250-258). He compared the St. Paul archdiocese to the dioceses of Boston and New York and pointed out that the percentage of children in Catholic schools was higher in St. Paul than in either of those two. He also wrote of the difficulties that pastors have in supporting Catholic schools: "Pastors everywhere complained of the burden they must impose upon their people to erect and sustain them" (p. 258). He also noted that in spite of great efforts, only 36 percent of Catholic children were in Catholic schools (p. 261).

Archbishop Ireland closed his presentation to the Congregation with a question:

> In view of the fact that on account of the poverty of our people the decrees of the Council of Baltimore regarding parochial schools cannot for the moment be executed in several parts of the United States, what plan of action can a bishop use meanwhile to procure instruction for those children who cannot in consequence for the present, be provided with parochial schools, and for which condition that Council has not provided? (Reilly, 1944, p. 266).

Since both sides had appealed to Rome, the special representative of the Roman Church, Archbishop Francesco Satolli, proposed a solution to end the school controversy. In his "14 propositions" Satolli backed Ireland and Bouquillon. In summary these propositions are: (1) The American church should continue to establish schools,

improve the ones already existing and make them all equal to public schools; (2) Catholic children may attend public schools where no Catholic school is available provided that there is no danger of perversion; (3) teachers in Catholic schools must pass a diocesan examination before being allowed to teach; (4) the church should establish normal schools where they are necessary; (5) no priest or bishop may exclude from the sacraments parents who do not send their children to Catholic schools, nor shall the priest or bishop exclude the children; (6) to the Catholic church belongs the right to teach faith and morals to youth. There is, however, no problem with children learning the arts and sciences in a public school; (7) the church does not condemn public schools or treat them with indifference, rather the church wishes that there should be public schools in every state. If there are things in the schools that are inimicable to Christianity then bishops and the citizens of the state should work to remove them; (8) if there is no danger to faith and morals, it is legitimate for Catholic parents to send their children to public schools as long as they and local pastors see to their religious instruction; (9) it is up to local diocesan bishops to decide whether parochial schools should and can be built; (10) the church should not condemn Catholic parents who send their children to private schools or academies as long as their religious instruction is provided for; (11) it is a good thing if the bishop and the local civil authorities work together to establish schools that are agreeable to both; (12) pastors must establish the best possible religious education programs for Catholic students in public schools from three possible plans; (13) Catholic school teachers should have diplomas recognized by the state; and (14) those teachers in Catholic schools who were trained in normal schools should receive degrees granted by the state. (Reilly, 1944, pp. 271-276).

Far from closing the controversy, Satolli's propositions intensified the disagreement among the American hierarchy, since some bishops saw the propositions as a threat to Catholic schools (Fogarty, 1985, p. 81). In May 1893, Leo XIII wrote a letter to Cardinal Gibbons officially ending the controversy. The letter defended Archbishop Satolli's propositions while admitting that they had been misinterpreted. The pope said that the decrees of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, especially those concerned with Catholic schools "are to be most sedulously promoted, and that it is left to the judgment and conscience of the ordinary to decide, according to the circumstances, when it is lawful, and when unlawful to at-

tend the public schools." He went on further to say that he was sure that Cardinal Gibbons "will also strive with all [his] power that the controversy being not only calmed, but totally ended, as it so greatly to be desired, the minds which had been excited by it may peacefully be united in mutual good will" (Reilly, 1944, pp. 228-229).

Even Pope Leo's letter did not end the controversy. On one side there were people like Bishop Ignatius Horstmann of Cleveland. At the turn of the century, he wrote to one of his priests:

> [M]y dear father you can tell your faithful people that a parish without a parochial school is not a Catholic parish. The parochial school is a rock foundation, the soul of the future. Their divine faith understood fully is the most precious inheritance parents can leave their children. With it practically lived up to they will gain heaven. Without it all else is valueless—a priest's work without a parochial school can only be half done and is very discouraging (Dolan, 1985, p. 242).

On the other side were people beset with seemingly impossible difficulties. In Archbishop Michael Corrigan's 1898 New York, only half of the parishes had schools which only educated one-third of the Catholic children. A seven million dollar school debt kept the church from expanding the schools. The situation was no better nationally. In 1900, only 37 percent of the parishes had schools, compared to 38 percent in 1883. By 1920, the figure was 35 percent (Dolan, 1985, pp. 275-276.)

Americanism

In 1899, another controversy forced Rome to intervene and this one questioned the orthodoxy of American Catholicism. Conservative Catholics were afraid that the approaches of Gibbons, Ireland and Keane to issues such as the school question, labor, and the participation of Catholics in the World's Parliament of Religions at Chicago in 1893 would dilute orthodox Catholicism. The spark for the controversy came from France through the French translation of Walter Eliott's *Life of Father Hecker*. The controversy raged on both sides of the Atlantic until Leo XIII appointed a commission of cardinals to study the issue (Fogarty, 1985, pp. 143-180).

The pope responded in 1899 with a letter, *Testem bene volentiae*, addressed to Cardinal Gibbons. In it the pope outlined several false doctrines which he carefully noted were "said to exist" in the

American church. Ellis (1969) summarized the errors in this way: "That the Church should adapt itself to modern civilization, relax its ancient vigor, show indulgence to modern theories and methods, deemphasize religious vows, and give greater scope for the action of the Holy Spirit on the individual soul" (p. 121).

Each side of the controversy claimed vindication with the publication of the papal letter. Conservative bishops like those of New York and Milwaukee thanked the pope for keeping the American church free from heresy, while Cardinal Gibbons wrote to Leo XIII: "This doctrine, which I deliberately called extravagant and absurd, this Americanism as it is called, has nothing in common with the views, aspirations, doctrine and conduct of Americans." (Ellis, 1969, p. 121) The controversy did end with the pope's letter condemning Americanism. There was, however, a new spirit in the church. According to Forgary (1985), it was "a spirit of Roman authority and discipline, of loss of American independence and episcopal collegiality." The mistrust continued even after Pius X removed the United States from missionary status in 1908 (pp. 190, 204-205).

The Rapid Growth of Catholic Schools

After the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, Catholic schools expanded rapidly. Whether it was due to the decree of the council, continuing immigration, the growth of the church financially, or the fear of the public schools is difficult to discern. Table 1 gives a clear picture of the growth (Buetow, 1970, p. 179):

The founding of the Catholic Educational Association (later known as the National Catholic Educational Association) in 1904 shows the strength of Catholic schools. This voluntary organization was formed from three separate Catholic organizations made up of colleges, parish schools and seminaries (Hochwalt, 1956, pp. 122-

TABLE 1—Catholic Parochial School Growth in the U.S., 1880–1920

YEAR	CATHOLIC POPULATION	PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS	PUPILS
1880	6,143,222	2,246	405,234
1890	8,277,039	3,194	633,238
1900	10,129,677	3,811	854,523
1910	14,347,027	4,845	1,237,251
1920	17,735,553	5,852	1,701,219

123). The purposes of the organization were reported in the minutes of the first meeting:

> It will bring together at stated intervals the leading Catholic educators of the country, and give an opportunity of exchanging views and of discussing educational problems. It will stimulate, support, and extend Catholic educational activity, and afford encouragement to all engaged in the work. It will make us aware of the defects of our system, and through it the experience of one may become the profit of all. It will make us conscious of our power, and help us to direct our energy, and to make the most effective use of our resources. It will help in the work of organizing parish schools into unified diocesan systems. It should help to promote harmony and coordination of all Catholic educational interests (Buetow, 1970, p. 181).

Another significant event in Catholic education in the United States was the 1889 founding of The Catholic University of America. At the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, Bishop John Lancaster Spaulding of Peoria, Illinois had argued strongly for the founding of the university. He was also instrumental in establishing Sisters' College at The Catholic University. One of his lifelong dreams was improving the quality of Catholic teachers (Curti, 1935, p. 355).

This period also saw the development of the secondary school in the United States. While the comprehensive high school did not appear until after World War I, by the 1880s secondary schools were beginning to replace academies. In 1893, the NEA through its Committee of Ten on secondary school studies recommended that high schools become an integral part of the American public educational system. Although high schools were generally college preparatory, the 1917 Smith-Hughes Act started the development of vocational education in public high schools.

Although the Catholic Educational Association committee on high schools found that in 1908 there was as many as 500 parish schools that had high school grades, Catholics were generally unable to compete financially with public schools. In 1890, Philadelphia had founded the first central high school and planned to establish these kinds of schools whenever possible (Buetow, 1970, pp. 182-184).

Catholic schools also made special efforts to establish schools for the negroes and native Americans in the country. Several religious communities, such as the Josephite Fathers and the Fathers of the Holy Ghost, devoted themselves exclusively to work among

blacks in this country. A number of religious orders of women, including the Millhill Franciscan Sisters of Baltimore, also worked extensively among blacks. Perhaps the most famous example is Mother Katherine Drexel, the foundress of the Sisters of the Blessed Sacrament. Mother Katharine used her considerable family fortune for work among blacks and native Americans.

Catholics worked under the contract school system with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to provide schools for American-Indians. When the appropriations were cut in 1902, Cardinal Gibbons established the annual appeal "In behalf of the negro and Indian missions in the United States" (Buetow, 1970, pp. 205-211).

In this period of transistion, the church saw a renewed interest in Catholic education. The coming of World War I would change the face of the nation again and propel it into a new era of industrial growth and change.

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS COME OF AGE

American Society 1918-1964

In 1918, the United States was tired of "the war to end all wars." The country was also frightened by the fear that communist Russia planned a world uprising of workers. New outbreaks of nativism occurred, especially through such organizations as the Ku Klux Klan. This new nativism was aimed at blacks, Catholics, Jews and anyone who was foreign-born. Even the Congress was affected by this new spirit. In 1921, it passed the first of a series of restrictive immigration laws which gradually closed the nation to outsiders. These laws did, however, make a contribution to the maturity of the Catholic church in the United States in that they allowed the church to become more or less stabilized for the first time (Ellis, 1969, p. 129).

With the 1920s came economic prosperity, the jazz age, talking pictures, trans-atlantic flights and the beginnings of the dominance of the automobile. Economic prosperity and the optimism of the country was destroyed by the stock market crash of October 1929 and the beginning of the great depression. In the 1930s, Franklin Roosevelt started the New Deal, a series of economic reforms that began to bring the country out of the depression. The individualism of the 1920s gave way to more communitarian ideas in the 1940s and 1950s but an increase in alcoholism and drug addiction among the young suggested serious problems. Schools came in for their share of criticism as a cause for America's problems. America

became a nation of readers; it was also fast becoming a nation of television-watchers. In 1947, there were only 12 television stations in the entire country.

The 1950s could be called the age of technological revolution, especially in terms of consumer products. All of the comforts that are considered essential today had their start in the American home in the 1950s. Air conditioning, washers and dryers, garbage disposals, power mowers, all entered the American home in great numbers in the 1950s. The Cold War rivalry between Russia and the United States kept Americans fearful of mass extermination. Spiritual writers like Bishop Fulton J. Sheen and Norman Vincent Peale provide solace (Buetow, 1970, pp. 219-220).

In October 1957, the Soviet Union launched Sputnik, the first satellite in earth orbit. A shocked America vented its frustrations on the educational system. In the wake of Sputnik progressive education in the United States came under increasing attack. The emphasis was on science, mathematics and foreign languages, without of course lessening the emphasis on social sciences and the humanities. Vice Admiral Hyman Rickover, the father of the nuclear submarine, claimed in 1959 that John Dewey had caused American schools to be anti-intellectual and incapable of distinguishing between training and education. In the same year James B. Conant's *The American High School Today* called for reform of the American high school. In 1958 Congress had passed the National Defense Education Act whose purpose was to strengthen the programs in mathematics, science, engineering and modern languages. Educational reform began to focus on the disparity of educational opportunities throughout the United States (Buetow, 1970, pp. 281-282).

The Continued Growth of Catholic Schools

In 1917, there were 5,687 parishes with schools in the United States enrolling 1,537,644 students out of a total Catholic population of 17,022,879. In 1936, there were 9,874 elementary and secondary schools with a total enrollment of 2,387,625. In 1957, there were 12,157 Catholic schools (9,772 elementary and 2,385 secondary) with 4,431,783 students (3,709,020 elementary and 722,763 secondary) out of a total Catholic population of 34.5 million (Buetow, 1970, pp. 225-226). In 1965, there were 13,842 Catholic schools (2,465 secondary and 11,359 elementary) with 5,662,328 students (1,095,519 secondary and 4,566,809 elementary) out of a total Catholic population of 45,640,619.

In 1919, the Catholic church published a codification of universal church law called the Code of Canon Law. In that code, the church devoted twelve canons (1372 to 1383) to schools. The canons reiterated the basic right of the Catholic church to establish schools (Canon 1375) and called for the establishment of schools throughout the church. Canon 1379 stated: "If the Catholic elementary and intermediate schools contemplated by Canon 1373 are lacking, provision shall be made, especially by local ordinaries, that they be established." The code went on to state that Catholic children should not attend non-Catholic schools unless they had permission from the local bishop (Canon 1374). Parish and diocesan schools were completely subject to the authority of the bishop. Schools run by religious communities or other groups were subject to the bishop only in matters of catechetics.

Another important church document for Catholic education in the United States was the publication in 1929 of Pope Pius XI's *The Christian Education of Youth*. This encyclical declared that the only true education was Catholic education:

> In fact, since education consists essentially in preparing man for what he must be and for what he must do here below, in order to attain the sublime end for which he was created, it is clear that there can be no true education which is not wholly directed to man's last end, and that in the present order . . . there can be no ideally perfect education which is not Christian education (*Five Great*, 1939, p. 37).

In 1939, the secondary department of the National Catholic Educational Association listed seven qualities necessary for Catholic secondary education: the training of Catholics who were intelligent, spiritually vigorous, cultured, healthy, vocationally prepared, social-minded and truly American. In 1944, the United States bishops' Commission on American Citizenship headed by Monsignor George Johnson of The Catholic University published five major goals for Catholic education in a democratic society: physical fitness, economic literary, social virtue, cultural development and moral perfection (Buetow, 1970, pp. 231-232).

This period also saw a desire for increased teacher education. In 1925, one Catholic educator called for the completion of normal schools for teaching elementary schools, the completion of college for teaching in secondary schools. During the same era, Catholic colleges started summer schools for religious teachers in Catholic

schools. In 1954, religious women in the United States founded the Sister Formation Movement to improve their preparation for teaching. The word formation rather than education was chosen consciously to reflect the need for spiritual and intellectual development. In 1951, Pius XII added his own call for the adequate formation of teachers when he wrote:

> Many of your schools are being described and praised to Us as being very good. But not all. It is Our fervent wish that all endeavor to become excellent. This presupposes that your teaching Sisters are masters of the subjects they expound. See to it, therefore, that they are well trained and that their education corresponds in quality and academic degrees to that demanded by the State (Buetow, 1970, pp. 251-252).

Catholic Schools and the Supreme Court

While Roman Catholics were working to establish Catholic schools, some people were questioning whether or not nongovernmental schools even had the right to exist. In 1922, the state of Oregon passed the Compulsory Education Act that required that every child between the ages of 8 and 16 be sent to a public school in the district where they child resided. Part of the issue was the rights of parents to educate their children in the schools of their choice; part was the patriotism of nonpublic schools, since the state had argued that the act was necessary "in order to prevent the teaching of disloyalty and subservice radicalism or bolshevism" (*Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, 1925, 515). The question was not the power of the state to regulate, to inspect or to supervise schools; rather the question was does the Oregon school law interfere with the rights of parents to direct the education of their children. Justice McReynolds wrote:

> As often heretofore pointed out, rights guaranteed by the Constitution may not be abridged by legislation which has no reasonable relation to some purpose within the competency of the State. The fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments in this Union repose excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only. The child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations (*Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, 1925, 535).

Once it had established that nongovernmental schools had the right to exist, the court was called upon to determine whether

these schools could benefit from state funds. In 1928, the state of Louisiana passed the law that allowed public funds to be used for school books for all the children of the state. When the challenge to this law eventually reached the Supreme Court, Chief Justice Hughes said:

> All cases to reach the Supreme Court that involved Catholic schools, in one way or another, concerned the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. That Amendment states in part that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof" (United States Constitution, 1791, First Amendment).
>
> The appropriations were made for the specific purpose of purchasing school books for use of the school children of the state, free of cost to them. It was for their benefit and the resulting benefit to the state that the appropriations were made. True, these children attend some school, public or private, the latter sectarian or non-sectarian, and that the books are to be furnished them for their use, free of cost, whichever they attend. The schools, however, are not the beneficiaries of these appropriations. They obtain nothing from them, nor are they relieved of a single obligation, because of them. The school children and the state are alone the beneficiaries. . . . Among these books, naturally, none is to be expected, adapted to religious instruction (*Cochran v. Louisiana*, 1930, 374-375).

It is in this decision that the child-benefit theory comes into law.

In 1947, the court heard a New Jersey case regarding the reimbursement of money to parents for the transportation of children to and from Catholic schools. The case of *Everson v. Board of Education of Ewing Township* was judged in the light of the First Amendment, the Fourteenth Amendment and the child benefit theory established by *Cochran*. Out of the five to four decision came two principles that would influence the court for the next 20 years, child benefit and neutrality. Writing for the majority, Justice Black argued that "New Jersey cannot hamper citizens in the free exercise of their religion. Consequently, it cannot exclude individual Catholics, Lutherans, Mohammedans . . . or the members of any other faith, *because of the faith or lack of it*, from receiving the benefits of public welfare legislation (*Everson v. Board of Education*, 1947, 16).

Black insisted that the principle of neutrality be respected. He made an important distinction in saying that the First Amendment

demands that the state be neutral in its relations with all its citizens, both believers and nonbelievers. He said "it does not require the state to be their adversary. State power is no more to be used so as to handicap religions than it is to favor them." (*Everson v. Board of Education*, 1947, 16).

In 1948, relying on Everson, the Supreme Court declared that the released-time program of religious instruction as conducted in Champaign, Illinois was unconstitutional. The problem was that the Champaign school board allowed religious instruction in the public schools. The court held that public school buildings which were built and supported by public monies were not to be used for the teaching of religion and that the public schools compulsory attendance law had assisted sectarian groups in the dissemination of their faith (*McCollum v. Board of Education*, 1948).

In 1952, the court ruled on the constitutionality of another released-time program in New York City. This time the justices in *Zorach v. Clauson* (1952) said that the released-time program was constitutional because the religious instruction took place outside of public school property. More Supreme Court cases were to have major effects on Catholic schools during the next twenty years.

Vatican Council II

No event in the recent history of the Roman Catholic Church has so altered its identity as the Second Vatican Council. Held in Rome from 1962 to 1965, the council issued 16 constitutions, declarations and decrees on a broad range of subjects from church worship to the church's relationship with the contemporary world. One example of the radical change that the council produced was the church's understanding of itself. For the first time in centuries, the church looked at itself not as a hierarchically structured institution but as the "People of God."

In the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* (1964), the bishops at the council stated: "Though they differ essentially and not only in degree, the common priesthood of the faithful and the ministerial or hierarchical priesthood are none-the-less ordered one to another; each in its own proper way shares in the one priesthood of Christ" (#10). In that same document the council said: "The holy People of God shares also in Christ's prophetic office; it spreads abroad a living witness to him, especially by a life of faith and love and by offering to God a sacrifice of praise . . ." (#12).

The statement on education was one of the last documents published by the council. Presented in October 1965, the the *Declaration on Christian Education* called for the establishment of schools throughout the world so that people can become as complete human beings that they could be (preface). People of every race and nation have "an inalienable right to education" that is suitable to the abilities and national traditions of the individual students. These schools should be as up-to-date as possible so that the students may participate as actively as possible in the life of society (*Declaration*, 1965, #1).

Pastors are responsible for education in their parishes. The council reminded pastors of "their very grave obligation to do all in their power to ensure that this Christian education is enjoyed by all the faithful and especially by the young who are the hope of the church (*Declaration*, 1965, #2).

Parents have the primary right and responsibility of educating their children. The bishops at the council wrote that "the role of parents in education is of such importance that it is almost impossible to provide an adequate substitute." The state and the church also have special concerns in education, for parents are not to be left alone with the heavy burden of education. However, the principle of subsidiarity always applies in matters of such importance (Declaration, 1965, #3).

In teaching about Catholic schools, the council was emphatic:

> Among the various organs of education the school is of outstanding importance. In nurturing the intellectual faculties which is its special mission, it develops a capacity for sound judgment and introduces the pupils to the cultural heritage bequeathed to them by former generations. It fosters a sense of values and prepares them for professional life. By providing for friendly contacts between pupils of different characters and backgrounds it encourages a mutual understanding. Furthermore, it constitutes a center in whose activity and growth not only the families and teachers but also the various associations for the promotion of cultural, civil and religious life, civic society, and the entire community should take part (*Declaration*, 1965, #5).

The state also has duties to parents:

> Parents, who have a primary and inalienable duty and right in regard to the education of their children, should enjoy the fullest liberty in their choice of school. The public authority, therefore, whose duty it is to protect and defend the liberty of the citizens,

> is bound according to the principles of distributive justice to ensure that public subsidies to schools are so allocated that parents are truly free to select schools for the children in accordance with their conscience (*Declaration*, 1965, #6).

In describing Catholic schools, the council bishops said that they are just as zealous in the promotion of human values as any other schools. However, it is a special function of the Catholic schools to develop students in their faith and to prepare them to take their places in the world to work for the good of all people and to extend the kingdom of God (*Declaration*, 1965, #8).

Although it insisted on the place of schools in the mission of the church, the bishops at the council moved people so strongly in new directions that Catholic schools tended to be just one other item in a long list of priorities. The schools began to suffer from the lack of interest of many church leaders. That lack was to have a telling effect in later years.

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS AFTER VATICAN II

Catholic Schools and the Supreme Court Continued

In 1968, a New York state textbook case once again raised the issue of how to maintain the nonestablishment of religion clause while allowing the state to care for the welfare of all children. In *Board of Education v. Allen* (1968), the court upheld the constitutionality of textbook loans. Basing its decision on *Everson*, the court held that "the Establishment Clause does not prevent a State from extending the benefits of State laws to all citizens without regard for their religious affiliation" (241). At the same time, Justice White acknowledged that "the line between state neutrality to religion and state support of religion is not easy to locate" (242).

Referring to a test applied to a bible reading case (*School District of Abington Township v. Schemp*, 1963) Justice White said that the test to be applied in regard to the Establishment Clause is "'What are the purpose and primary effect of the enactment? If either is the advancement or inhibition of religion then the enactment exceeds the legislative power circumscribed by the Constitution'" (*Board of Education v. Allen*, 1968, 242). In this case, this court approved loans of secular textbooks to students in nongovernmental schools.

In 1971, the Supreme Court handed down three opinions that set the course for all future litigation in regard to church-related schools. In *Lemon v. Kurtzman* (1971), the court ruled a Pennsylvania purchase of secular educational services from nongovernmental schools unconstitutional. In *Earley v. DiCenso* (1971), the court found Rhode Island's salary supplement provision for teachers in Roman Catholic schools unconstitutional. In *Tilton v. Richardson* (1971), the court found the Federal Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 constitutional, even though it applied the same three-part test of constitutionality in each case.

The new Chief Justice, Warren Burger wrote the opinion in *Lemon v. Kurtzman* (1971). He presented a succinct three-

part test for determining if legislation is constitutionally permissable under the religion clauses of the First Amendment. The test reads simply:

> First, the statute must have a secular legislative purpose; second, its principle or primary effect must be one that neither advances nor inhibits religion, *Board of Education v. Allen*, 392 U.S. 236, 243 (1968); finally, the statute must not foster "an excessive entanglement with religion." *Walz, supra*, at 674, (612-13).

Later in the opinion, Burger added a corollary to the entanglement test, namely "political fragmentation and divisiveness on religious lines" (*Lemon v. Kurtzman*, 1971, 623). He took entanglement into the political process when he said:

> Ordinarily political debate and division, however vigorous or even partisan, are normal and healthy manifestations of our democratic system of government, but political division along religious lines was one of the principal evils against which the First Amendment was intended to protect.... The potential divisiveness of such conflict is a threat to the normal political process.... To have States or communities divide on the issue presented by state aid to parochial schools would tend to confuse and obscure other issues of great urgency (*Lemon v. Kurtzman*, 1971, 622).

This tripartite test has been applied in almost all subsequent religion clause cases. In *Tilton v. Richardson* (1971), Chief Justice Burger applied the same test to the Higher Educational Facilities Act for colleges and universities and found that act constitutional. He thought that there was little chance of excessive government entanglement in one-time construction grants (*Tilton v. Richardson*, 1971, 688).

In 1972, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, through its administrative arm, the United States Catholic Conference, set up an interdenominational group to lobby for federal income tax credits. Called CREDIT, the organization looked as if it had a good chance of success. It had the backing of the White House and the powerful chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. The issue, however, never got to a vote in the congress because of another decision by the Supreme Court (O'Brien and Vacca, 1974, pp. 74-87).

In *Committee for Public Education and Religious Liberty v. Nyquist (1973), Justice Powell used the* Lemon test in the opinion that struck down New York state's education and tax laws which established three different financial aid programs for non-governmental elementary and secondary schools (2965). That aid included monies for maintenance and repair of buildings, tuition reimbursement to low income families, and tax credits to families who did not qualify for tuition reimbursement (2960-2962). Because of Justice Powell's strong opinion in the six to three decision, the American bishops stopped funding any attempt to obtain federal money for parents of nongovernmental children.

In *Hunt v. McNair* (1973), a case involving the South Carolina Educational Facilities Act aimed at helping colleges construct buildings, Justice Powell applied the same test he used in *Nyquist*. Using *Tilton* as a precedent, he found no unconstitutional entangelment. The test was also applied rigorously in *Meek v. Pittenger* (1975), in *Wolman v. Walter* (1977), and in *Committee for Public Education and Religious Liberty v. Reagan* (1980).

In 1979, the Catholic bishops established the Office for Educational Assistance as a part of the education department of the United States Catholic Conference. The main purpose of this office was to help nongovernmental schools oftain financial aid. This time, however, the effort was not funded with church money but with a grant from the Knights of Columbus. The office closed in 1984 after a tax credit bill failed on the floor of the senate after extensive lobbying.

The nongovernmental schools were encourageed by a 1983 decision which changed the way the court applied the three-part test. In *Mueller v. Allen* (1983), Justice Rehnquist acknowledged that the court has been guided by the three part test laid down in *Lemon*, but added that "while this principle is well established, our cases have also emphasized that it provides 'no more than [a] help-

ful sign' in dealing with establishment clause challenges" (3066). Justice Rehnquist found that the Minnesota statute under consideration had a clear secular legislative purpose and that the statute neither advances nor inhibits religion.

First, the deduction for tuition was only one of many deductions that the Minnesota legislature had allowed taxpayers. Second, the deduction was available to all parents including those with children attending public schools. Third, the Minnesota statute provided aid through individual parents, although the court did acknowledge that "financial assistance provided to parents ultimately has an economic effect comparable to that of aid given directly to the schools attended by their children" (*Mueller v. Allen*, 1983, 3069).

Justice Rehnquist dismissed the third part of the test, an excessive government entanglement with religion, as being easily within constitutional grounds. All the state had to do in this particular instance was decide on the applicability of certain textbooks for deductions (*Mueller v. Allen*, 1983, 3071). Rehnquist relegated the "political divisiveness" question to a footnote and said it is "confined to cases where direct financial subsidies are paid to parochial schools or to teachers in parochial schools" (*Mueller v. Allen*, 1983, 3071).

The four dissenting justices in *Mueller* claimed that there was no material difference between this case and *Nyquist*. Justice Marshall wrote:

> For the first time, the Court has upheld financial support for religious schools without any reason at all to assume that the support will be restricted to the secular functions of those schools and will not be used to support religious instruction. This result is flatly at odds with the fundamental principle that a State may provide no financial support whatsoever to promote religion" (*Mueller v. Allen*, 1983, 3078).

A further change in the application of the tripartite test occurred in *Lynch* v. *Donnelly*, (1984). Ironically, the opinion was written by the same Chief Justice Burger who established the test in *Lemon*. The case involved the placing of the nativity scene in Christmas display by the city of Pawtucket, Rhode Island.

In the beginning of the opinion, Justice Burger reviewed previous establishment clause cases and noted that the court must always "reconcile the inescapable tension between the the objective of preventing unnecessary intrusion of either the church or the

state upon the other, and the reality that, as the Court has so often noted, total separation of the two is not possible" (*Lynch v. Donnelly*, 1984, 1359). He went on to say that the concept of a wall of separation between church and state is a useful metaphor, but that "the metaphor itself is not a wholly accurate description of the practical aspects of the relationship that, in fact, exists between church and state" (1359).

The Chief Justice gave a long history of the establishment clause as interpreted by the court and explained that this history shows that "the Court consistently had declined to take a rigid, absolutist view of the Establishment Clause" (*Lynch v. Donnelly*, 1984, 1631). He further noted that "in each case, the enquiry calls for line-drawing; no-fixed, *per se* rule can be framed. The Establishment Clause like the Due Process Clauses is not a precise, detailed provision in a legal code capable of ready application" (1361-62). Most significantly, the court said:

> In the line-drawing process we have often found it useful to inquire whether the challenged law of conduct has a secular purpose, whether its principal or primary effect is to advance or inhibit religion, and whether it creates an excessive entanglement of government with religion. *Lemon, supra*. But, we have repeatedly emphasized our unwillingness to be confined to any single test or criterion in this sensitive area (*Lynch v. Donnelly*, 1984, 1362).

Applying the three-part test, the court held that the city's placing a nativity scene in a park did not violate the First Amendment to the Constitution. Using *Mueller*, Chief Justice Burger noted that "this case did not involve a direct subsidy to church-sponsored schools or colleges, or other religious institutions, and hence no inquiry into potential political divisiveness is even called for..." (*Lynch v. Donnelly*, 1984, 1365). What started out as a simple test of constitutionality that the court developed to apply to every case now seemed to be moving in the direction of a guideline.

The court took up the question again in two cases reported the same day. On the last day of the 1985 term, the court issued opinions in *Grand Rapids School District v. Ball* and *Aguilar v. Felton* that again reversed the trend of the previous opinions. The question in *Grand Rapids* was the operation of community education and shared time programs which provided classes in secular subjects taught by employees of the Grand Rapids public school district in classrooms leased from local religious schools.

The community education classes were provided in Catholic elementary schools after the regular school day by teachers in the religiously affiliated schools who then became parttime employees of the public schools. The shared time classes were provided in religious schools during the regular school day and included courses such as remedial and enrichment mathematics, reading and music. These teachers were fulltime employees of the local public school district.

There was no question about the religious nature of the schools. In the majority opinion, Justice Brennan characterized them as sectarian with a large number of their functions contributing to the religious mission of the school (*Grand Rapids v. Ball*, 1985, 3220-21). The court then reaffirmed the validity of the three-part test from *Lemon*. It found that the two programs did have a secular purpose, but concluded that they did have the primary effect of advancing religion (3223). The court did not decide the issue on whether the Grand Rapids program impermissibly entangled the government with religion (3230).

The issue in *Aguilar v. Felton* was the federal Chapter I program in New York City. The program provided instruction in remedial reading and mathematics, English as a second language, and guidance services. The instruction was carried out by public school employees in sectarian schools in rooms free from religious symbols. Materials and equipment used in the program were used only for Chapter I purposes. Public school supervisors monitored the classes to insure, among other things, that their employees avoided involvement with religious activities.

Justice Brennan concluded that "the supervisory system established by the City of New York inevitably results in the excessive entanglement of church and state, an Establishment Clause concern distinct from that addressed by the effects doctrine" (*Aguilar v. Felton*, 1985, 3237). The aid was provided in a pervasively sectarian environment in religiously affiliated schools. Further, because the aid was provided in the form of teachers, ongoing inspection was required to ensure the absence of a religious message despite the fact that the teachers were public school employees. In Justice Brennan's view, "the pervasive monitoring by public authorities in the sectarian schools infringes precisely those Establishment Clause values at the root of the prohibition of excessive entanglement" (3228).

It is difficult to predict the effects of these opinions on the outcome of future cases. The decisions were five to four, with Justice Powell casting the swing vote. Appointments to the court by the Reagan administration would probably be more favorable to aid to religiously oriented schools than some of the current justices. That kind of speculation has, however, often been proven wrong.

Catholic Schools in Decline

In 1965, there were 5,574,000 students in 13,292 Catholic elementary and secondary schools. In 1986, there were 2,821,000 students in 9,245 Catholic elementary and secondary schools in the United States (*United States*, 1986, pp. 12, 8). These schools were staffed by 146,594 full-time professional staff members. Of these 19 percent were religious and 81 percent were lay people. In 1965, 64 percent of the teachers in Catholic schools were religious (DataBank, 1986).

The Catholic population of the United States is concentrated in the large urban areas of the east and midwest. Over 54 percent of all Catholic schools and 57 percent of all students are located in the mideast and the Great Lakes area (Delaware, Washington, DC, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio and Wisconsin). The 15 states of the west and far west have only 16 percent of the schools and 15.5 percent of the students. The remaining 30 percent of the schools and 27 percent of the students are located in the 25 New England, plains and southeastern states (*United States*, 1986, pp. 8, 12). There is some evidence, however, that the Catholic school population is shifting toward the "sunbelt" states. For example, in 1967-68, 21 percent of all Catholic school enrollment nationally was located in the southeast and the west. By 1984-85, the figure had risen to 27 percent (*United States*, 1985, p. 12).

Historically, Catholic immigrants settled in large cities. This trend continues in the fact that only 26 percent of the elementary schools and 18 percent of the secondary schools are located in small towns and rural areas. Many of the Catholic schools that had been closed or consolidated in the last 20 years have been small town and rural schools (*United States*, 1986, p. 9).

Because of the heavy concentration in urban areas, there has been a steady increase in the percentage of minority students. Catholic schools had always played an important part in educating the urban poor. In the past, those students were Irish, German, Polish,

Italian and other ethnic Catholics. Now the urban poor are Hispanic and largely non-Catholic black students. Greeley (1982) has written that:

> Catholic secondary schools are particularly successful in education of blacks and Hispanics, young people from a lower social-class background. It is legitimate to wonder whether the reason for this might be that these schools were initially established—for the most part between 1910 and 1960—to educate the children of the immigrant class and prepare them for upward mobility. If such is the case, the apparent success of Catholic high schools with poor blacks and Hispanics would have less to do with race and more with social class: Catholic schools have their seeming success with blacks and Hispanics because they are geared to work with the upwardly mobile "poor" (p. 77).

Over 22 percent of Catholic school students in 1984-85 were black, Hispanic, Asian-American or American-Indians, up from 11 percent in 1970-71 (*United States*, 1986, p. 15). Nearly 30 percent of the enrollment in the 10 largest Catholic school systems is minority and the figures for large dioceses are even higher, for example, 58 percent in Los Angeles, 45 percent in San Francisco, 44 percent in Oakland and Miami, 43 percent in New York, 40 percent in Brooklyn, 38 percent in Washington and 31 percent in Chicago and Newark (*United States*, 1985, pp. 16-18).

The religious composition of Catholic schools has also changed. Approximately 11 percent of Catholic school students in 1983-84 were non-Catholics, up from 2.7 percent in 1969-70. Minority students and non-Catholic students are related since 64 percent of black students, 24 percent of Asian-American students and 22 percent of American-Indian students are non-Catholics, whereas only 6.5 percent of white students are non-Catholics (*United States*, 1985, pp. 11, 18).

While Catholic school enrollment has decreased, other church-related schools have had dramatic increases in enrollment almost balancing off the declining Catholic schools (*United States*, 1986, p. 5). Several reasons are given for the 48 percent decline in Catholic school enrollment during the time when the rest of American private education more than doubled. One reason was simple demographics. The number of available Catholic children measured by the number of infant baptisms declined steadily from 1965. In 1965, there were 1,436,622 baptisms; in 1975, there were 876,306, a drop of 39 percent (*The Official*, 1984, statistical summary).

Greeley (1976) has suggested that geographic unavailability has also been a major factor. As the Catholic population moved steadily into suburbs, new Catholic schools were not built in sufficient numbers to accommodate the students (p. 235). A third factor has been cost. In 1965, very few Catholic schools had anything more than a minimum tuition. Today, tuition rates are substantial. In 1985 the median high school tuition was $1,230 per student (*The Catholic High School*, 1985, p. 104). Catholic elementary schools are estimated to have a mean cost of $947 per student and a mean tuition of approximately $550. (*United States Catholic*, 1986, p. 5).

Attitudinal changes also had played a major role in the decline of Catholic schools. Since the Third Plenary Council of 1884 until the 1960s, bishops and priests presented Catholic school attendance as a serious obligation. As has been noted earlier, there were regional and ethnic differences in the responses of the Catholic laity to the decrees of the council, but rarely any open disagreement with a strong pro-school policy. In the 1960s and 70s, this policy came under serious attack. One of the earliest and therefore prototypical attack was Mary Perkins Ryan's book *Are Parochial Schools the Answer?* published in 1964. Buetow (1970) summarized her arguments against Catholic schools as follows:

1. The Catholic School system is a relic of the siege mentality.
2. General education can and should be separated from religious formation in these times and in this country.
3. Catholic schools are financial handicaps and therefore remain mediocre.
4. The manner in which Catholic schools present religious education is too formal to be effective in life.
5. In a pluralistic society they are divisive.
6. They are contrary to the spirit of ecumenism.
7. They consume time, effort and money that might better be spent upon adult formation in catechetical centers and Newman Clubs (p. 290).

Other trends had negative effects on Catholic schools. Mass attendance decreased, more and more parents started sending their children to public schools, marriages with members of other faith increased and Catholics continued to be at odds with the church's position on birth control. There were also significant changes in the attitudes and behaviors of religious and priests. Vocations to religious life plummeted during the 1960s and 1970s. For example, in

1965, there were 48,922 men studying for the priesthood; in 1985, there were 11,262. The number of priests has remained relatively stable, 58,632 in 1965 and 57,891 in 1984. The number of religious brothers dropped from 12,271 to 7,596. Most importantly for Catholic schools, the number of sisters went from 181,421 in 1966 to 118,027 in 1984, a decline of 35 percent (*The Official*, 1965, 1985, statistical summaries). The declines came from the smaller number of entrance into religious life and also from the fact that thousands of sisters, priests and brothers have resigned the active ministry in the last 20 years.

The dramatic decline in the number of sisters affected Catholic schools in several ways. First, it created a need for additional lay teachers; the salary differentials between the two groups sharply increased per pupil cost. Second, the decline in religious created the need for higher religious salaries since the number of salary-earning religious as compared to the number of retired and infirm sisters increased substantially. Third, since lay teachers do not live in communities which constantly reinforce religious practices and ideals, and since a majority of them received their degrees from non-Catholic colleges and universities, the whole religious purpose of Catholic schools came into question. Fourth, the radical changes in the church may have created some questions in the minds of Catholic parents about some previously unquestioned values as to the necessity of Catholic school education.

Greeley (1976) offered the opinion that many bishops, parish priests and religious community leaders have also pulled back from their support of Catholic schools as money problems and other needs increased (pp. 311-312). As with all other institutions, money is essential for the operation of schools. Roman Catholics spend over three billion dollars each year on Catholic school education. In 1985, 40 percent of that money came from tuition; another 46 percent came from the free will offerings of parishioners in the Sunday collection; 14 percent came from other sources (*United States*, 1986, p. 6).

Because of the wide-ranging authority given to them by the *Code of Canon Law*, pastors are very important to schools. While almost all dioceses have policies regarding the opening and closing of schools that limit the power of the pastor, in other areas his power is great. For example, a recent survey of diocesan school offices revealed that 55.6% of the dioceses in the United States did not have any system-wide policies in regard to financial compensation

for lay teachers or administrators. This kind of freedom gives local pastors enormous discretion in the critical area of school faculty. Even when there is a local school board, it is consultative (O'Brien, 1985, p. 3).

The news is not all bad. The student-teacher ratio dropped from 31:1 to 21:1 on the elementary level and from 19:1 to 15:1 on the secondary level between 1968-69 and 1984-85 (*United States*, 1986, p. 17). Almost all of the 173 Catholic dioceses in the United States have some kind of board of education with major lay participation and many Catholic schools have boards with consultative power in matters of school finance, personnel, curriculum and policy. While no exact figures exist on how many parish schools have boards, 78 percent of all Catholic secondary schools have them (Augenstein, 1986, p. 1). However, most parishes in the country have parish pastoral councils, something that indicates a high degree of lay participation.

The last 20 years have been a time of increased political and legal activity in support of Catholic schools. In 1965, Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the largest federal educational program ever authorized and the first one to include Catholic school students on an equal basis. Catholic schools have adopted modern fiscal management practices using accepted principles of budgeting, accounting and long-range financial planning.

Catholic schools are beginning to look seriously at long range financial planning as a way to ensure a stable future. Part of that planning involves professional financial development programs. In 1982-83, 55 percent of all Catholic high schools had a development office (*The Catholic High School*, 1985, p. 17). By looking at financial planning, Catholic schools are working toward long range financial stability.

CHAPTER 2

The Authority Structure of the Roman Catholic Church

After the pope, bishops and pastors are the most powerful people in the Roman Catholic church. Their authority comes from church law and church tradition. Their power comes from their traditional authority and their control of the church's money. Because of their power, they are a significant force in the decisions about whether parishes continue to support schools or whether they start new schools.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE CHURCH

The bishop is responsibile for education within his diocese and the pastor of a parish is responsible for education in his parish. Vatican Council II directed pastors "to their very grave obligation to do all in their power to ensure that this Christian education is enjoyed by all the faithful and especially by the young who are the hope of the church" (*Declaration*, 1965, #2). Since the pastor is the final authority in the parish on all parish matters, including the school, his relationship to the school is critical.

The clearest expression of the structure of the Catholic church is contained in the *Code of Canon Law*, the 1,752 laws governing the universal church. The latest version supplanted the 1917 code begun by Pope Pius X in 1904. That 1917 code was an attempt to bring order into the catalogue of church laws begun by the twelfth century monk Gratian (*Code of Canon Law*, 1983, p. xvii).

In management terms, the Roman Catholic church is a flat hierarchy containing only three levels: pope, bishops, pastors. The pastors report to the bishops; the bishops report to the pope. The code makes it clear that the pope is at the top of the hierarchy. It states that "the bishop of the Church of Rome . . . is the head of the College of Bishops. . . . Therefore, in virtue of his office he enjoys supreme, full, immediate and universal ordinary power in the Church, which he can always freely exercise" (Canon 331).

Thus the law states that the pope has complete legal authority over any and all aspects of the church including a local Catholic parish. The code further states that "the Roman Pontiff by virtue of his office, not only has power in the universal Church, but also possesses a primacy of ordinary power over all particular churches and groupings of churches . . ." (Canon 333, #1). In the same canon it states that "there is neither appeal nor recourse against the decision or decree of the Roman Pontiff" (Canon 333, #3).

The pope receives help in governing the church from the college of bishops, especially when the bishops are gathered in an ecumenical council (Canon 337). He also receives advice from a special synod of bishops (a smaller group called together by the pope for particular advice, Canon 342) and from the College of Cardinals (Canon 349). The pope receives further assistance from the Roman *curia*, the bureaucracy which serves his wishes. This *curia* includes the Papal Secretariat of State, the Council for the Public Affairs of the Church, and 23 other assorted congregations, secretariats, and tribunals (Canon 367). It is clear, however, that the authority resides strictly in the Roman Pontiff and not in the Roman *curia*.

The second level of church authority is that of diocesan bishops. In their own dioceses, bishops possess much of the authority that the pope possesses over the universal church. Church law states that "a diocesan bishop in the diocese committed to him possesses all the ordinary, proper and immediate power which is required for the exercise of his pastoral office, except for those cases which the law or decree of the Supreme Pontiff reserves to the supreme authority of the Church or to some other ecclesiastical authority" (Canon 381).

The diocesan bishop is admonished to show concern for "all the christian faithful who are committed to his care regardless of age, condition and nationality . . ." (Canon 183, #1). However, diocesan bishops are to pay particular attention to priests since they are "his assistants and advisors" (Canon 184).

Just as the pope has the Roman *curia* to help him in the administration of the universal church, so each diocesan bishop has a diocesan *curia* to help him in the governance of the entire diocese (Canon 649). By law the bishop is required to establish a presbyterial or priests' council (Canon 495), a college of priests consultors (Canon 502), and a diocesan finance council (Canon 492). He must also appoint the following people to assist him in his governance of the diocese: vicar general (Canon 475), a finance officer (Canon 494), a chancellor (Canon 482), and a promoter of missionary endeavors (Canon 791). Most bishops establish other structures as well; the complicated work of running a diocese demands additional help. It is always clear, however, that the authority resides in the bishop.

Nowhere does universal church law provide for a diocesan structure for Catholic schools. In regard to schools, the code states that "if schools imparting an education imbued with the Christian spirit are not available, the diocesan bishop is to see to it that they are established" (Canon 802).

The third hierarchical level in the Roman Catholic church is the pastor. A pastor is entrusted with the pastoral care of a parish. According to the law, "the pastor is the proper shepherd of the parish entrusted to him, exercising pastoral care in the community entrusted to him under the authority of the diocesan bishop in whose ministry of Christ he is being called to share . . ." (Canon 519; see also Canon 515, #1). His duty, like that of the bishop is to teach, sanctify and govern with the "assistance of lay members of the Christian faithful" (Canon 519). Further, "the pastor represents the parish in all juridic affairs . . . [and sees] to it that the goods of the parish are administered in accord with the norms . . ." (Canon 532).

The only structure mandated for a parish is a finance council. This council helps the pastor "in the administration of parish goods . . ." (Canon 537). If the diocesan bishop judges it opportune, he can mandate that a "pastoral council be established in each parish; the pastor presides over it, and through it the Christian faithful along with those who share in the pastoral care of the parish in virtue of their office, give their help in fostering pastoral activity" (Canon 536, #1). The second paragraph of that same canon states very clearly that the pastoral council possesses "a consultative vote" (Canon 536, #2). Clearly the pastor is the one responsible.

Most bishops and pastors have set up participative structures beyond those mandated by universal church law. In spite of good

intentions on the part of church leadership, current policy-making processes are in a state of transition. Part of the problem is due to the new revision of church law; part to differing leadership styles among pastors and bishops, and part to a lack of uniform structures and understandings. Whatever the reason, the present situation gives bishops and especially pastors enormous power over the current and future status of Catholic schools.

CHAPTER 5

Profile of United States Bishops and Priests

(NOTE: As mentioned in the preface, most of the information not related to all of the bishops and priests has been placed in a screen. If a reader is only interested in the major findings, the screened sections may be skipped.)

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Because of their power over the educational ministry of the church, bishops, pastors, and future pastors were polled on their perceptions concerning Catholic education. In *Catholic Schools in a Declining Church*, Greeley (1976) found evidence that some pastors and future pastors were not supportive of Catholic schools (pp. 311-312). The question was whether that finding was still true ten years later.

Bishops and priests were sent a questionnaire to determine how they (1) valued Catholic schools as part of the work of the church, (2) viewed the effectiveness of the schools, (3) evaluated the effectiveness of parish catechetical programs outside of schools (CCD) in relation to the schools, (4) viewed the present method of financing Catholic schools, (5) viewed the concept of regionalization and/or consolidation and centralization of Catholic schools, and (6) viewed increased parental involvement in a participatory decision-making role in the future of the Catholic schools.

Thus the purpose of the study was to investigate the perceptions of the Roman Catholic bishops, pastors, and future pastors of

the United States concerning the (1) value, (2) effectiveness, (3) funding practices and (4) future structure of Catholic schools.

A high percentage of the bishops responded, 80 percent or 219 out of 273 questionnaires sent. The response rate for the priests was 52 percent, 346 returns out of 660 sent. The priests' responses were validated by a second questionnaire to 45 priests who had not yet responded. (See Appendix A for additional information and Appendix B for a copy of the questionnaire.)

BACKGROUND DATA

The average age of an active bishop in the United States was 57. He has been ordained a priest for 32 years and a bishop for nine. Almost 65 percent of active bishops were over 55 years old (Table C1, Appendix C). Of those responding 68 percent were diocesan bishops, 31 percent auxiliaries, and one bishop was retired.

When the number of auxiliaries is reported in terms of the ten largest Catholic school states, that figure changes significantly. (New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, California, Ohio, New Jersey, Michigan, Louisiana, Massachusetts and Wisconsin have 68 percent of all Catholic school students in the nation, *United States*, 1986, p. 14). These ten largest states have 57 percent diocesan bishops and 43 percent auxiliaries as compared to 79 and 21 percent respectively for the other 40 states. The high concentration of Catholics in these ten states necessitates the appointing of auxiliary bishops to assist the diocesan bishops.

The bishops reflect ordination at age 25 whereas the average priest would have been ordained at 28. These data represent the trend toward later ordination of clergy in recent years. Ordination comes after 4 years of college plus 4 years of theology. For most older priests that was at age 25. Recently men have been entering theology studies after several years of work which has raised the age of ordination. Table 2 shows the length of time bishops and priests have been ordained.

Looking at the ages of priests according to the National Catholic Educational Association's data regions (Table C2, Appendix C), there were some unusual differences. For example, 53 percent of all the priests in New England were under 46, while only 24 percent in the Plains states were. The average for the entire United States for priests under 46 was 39 percent.

While only 39 percent of all priests in the nation were 56 or older, 52 percent of the priests in the Plains states were. New England also had an exceptionally low number of priests between the ages of 46 and 55, 8 percent (Table C3, Appendix C).

Just as there were regional differences in age, there were also regional differences in terms of years ordained a priest both in bishops and priests (Tables C4 and C5, Appendix C). In the New England region, 85.7 percent of the bishops have been ordained a priest over 30 years; in the West, only 45.2 percent have been ordained that long. The national average for bishops ordained over 30 years was 60 percent. By comparison the highest percentage of priests ordained over 30 years (50%) was found in the Plains region, while the low (24%) was in the Great Lakes. The national average for priests ordained over 30 years was 33 percent.

TABLE 2—Years Ordained a Priest

	RESPONDENTS			
	BISHOPS		PRIESTS	
YEARS	N	%	N	%
10 and under	0	0.0	69	19.9
11–20	9	4.1	85	24.6
21–30	78	35.6	77	22.3
31–40	86	39.3	82	23.7
41 and over	46	21.0	33	9.5
TOTAL	219	100.0	346	100.0

There was a strong correlation, .96 for bishops and .93 for priests by Spearman's rho, between years ordained a priest and age.

In terms of the location of their ministry, 32 percent of the priests worked in rural areas; However, as reported in Table 3, over 68 percent of all priests worked either in or close to cities.

Not surprisingly when the ten largest states were compared to all the others, the percentage of suburban assignments was almost twice as large in the top ten, 34 percent to 19 percent; at the same time, the number of rural assignments was 25 percent in the top ten and 40 percent in the others (Table C6, Appendix C).

TABLE 3—Location of Current Priest Assignment

LOCATION	RESPONDENTS %
Inner City	16.1
Urban	24.9
Suburban	27.3
Rural	31.7
	100.0

Table 4 shows the assignments of the various priests that responded to the questionnaire. Although the sample was thought to be composed of only priests in parish ministry, 12 percent of those responding listed their primary responsibility as non-parish.

It has been generally held that many vocations to the priesthood came from Catholic elementary and secondary schools. Although this study cannot posit a causal relationship, a very large percentage of bishops and priests attended both. Table 5 shows that 83 percent of the bishops attended Catholic elementary school and 84 percent Catholic secondary school; 85 percent of the priests attended Catholic elementary schools and 79 percent Catholic secondary schools (see also Tables C7, C8, C9, Appendix C).

Table 5 also indicates that a surprisingly large percentage of bishops and priests (41%) attended a Catholic college before entering the seminary. This large percentage may have resulted from a misreading of the question asked in the survey. The re-

TABLE 4—Present Role of Priests

ROLE	RESPONDENTS %
Pastor	63.3
Associate	21.7
Term Ministry	2.9
Non Parish	12.1
	100.0

TABLE 5—Catholic School Education

EDUCATION	RESPONDENTS	
	BISHOPS %	PRIESTS %
No Catholic elementary school	16.9	15.0
Catholic elementary school	83.1	85.0
No Catholic secondary school	15.7	20.6
Catholic secondary school	84.4	79.4
No Catholic college before seminary	59.4	58.8
Catholic college	40.6	41.2

spondents may have missed the phrase "before entering the seminary" and interpreted the college seminary as a Catholic college. Another indicator was that several bishops wrote in "college seminary" and answered "yes" to the question.

When regional differences were considered, the Great Lakes at 94 percent and the Plains at 88 percent were both above the national average for priests' attendance at Catholic elementary schools, 85 percent. The New England region had the lowest percentage at 79 percent (Table C10, Appendix C).

Priests' attendance at Catholic secondary schools showed a similar pattern when looked at regionally The national average for attendance of three to four years was 75 percent. The Great Lakes had the highest percentage at 85 percent followed by the Southeast at 83 percent, the Plains at 81 percent and the Mideast at 78 percent. Both the West at 60 percent and New England at 56 percent showed percentages considerably below the average (Table C11, Appendix C).

Table 6 indicates that a large percentage of the bishops (64%) and priests (70%) have spent six years or more of their priestly ministry in a parish with a school. Less than eight percent of both groups have never been in a parish with a school.

Regionally the Great Lakes, the Plains and the Mideast states all had larger percentages than the national average of priests who has spent six or more years in parishes with Catholic

schools. New England and the West showed higher percentages of priests who have never been in a parish with a Catholic school, 17 percent and 14 percent respectively, and along with the Southeast lower percentages of priests who have served in parishes with Catholic schools for six years or more (Table C12, Appendix C).

TABLE 6—Years in Parish with School

	RESPONDENTS			
	BISHOPS		PRIESTS	
YEARS	N	%	N	%
None	17	7.8	25	7.2
1–5	62	28.3	79	22.9
6–10	53	24.2	76	22.0
11 or more	87	39.7	165	47.8
TOTAL	219	100.0	345	100.0

Bishops and priests have been involved with Catholic schools in other ways. For example, 12 percent of the bishops have been superintendents of schools, 17 percent have been principals and 36 percent have taught fulltime in a Catholic school. Of the priests, only 9 percent have been principals and 19 percent have taught fulltime in Catholic schools.

Some of the bishops and priests were not happy with the questionnaire itself. One priest wrote: "Questions were well though out. I would have liked to have been neutral on some of these, but the scale did not allow it." A bishop wrote that the "questions are absolutely correct, but I found it impossible to answer them. There is not one of them that does not require a more nuanced, carefully distinguished reply, and I feel trapped by being pigeon-holed in this way." Of the 19 bishops and priests who commented on the questionnaire, most complained about the inability to give qualified answers or they objected to the forced-choice aspect of the questionnaire. They would have preferred an undecided category.

CHAPTER 4

The Value of Catholic Schools

The very existence of Catholic schools is dependent on the value placed on them by the people who use them and the people who sponsor them. The people who use the schools are parents and students. The traditional sponsors are the official leaders of the church, specifically bishops and priests.

The questionnaire sent to the bishops and priests contained items on the value they placed on Catholic schools, on the overall need for the existence of Catholic schools as alternatives to governmental schools, on the role the schools play in the mission of the church, and on priests' and bishops' views of the potential role Catholic schools have in preparing students to live in today's society as members of the church.

Overall Need for the Existence of Catholic Schools as Alternative Schools

The first question looked at whether or not there was a need for Catholic schools, given the quality of governmental schools. As Table 7 indicates, bishops were almost unanimous in stating their support for Catholic schools over against governmental or public schools. As one bishop put it, "I believe there is no adequate substitute for a good Catholic school, both in the elementary and secondary levels. We do need to search out new and better ways of financing our schools, besides tution." Another bishop wrote, "Catholic schools are the precious gems in the treasury of the church in the United States. They are directly responsible for the health and growth of the faith in our country." Priests also showed a high level of support, 80 percent, but not as high as bishops. Bishops who had

TABLE 7—Perceptions of Need for Catholic Schools Today

QUESTIONS	RESPONDENTS	
	BISHOPS %	PRIESTS %
Disagreement that		
The differences between Catholic and public schools are no longer great enough to justify two separate school systems	96.8	80.0
Agreement that		
The need for Catholic schools is at least as great today as it was in the past	92.7	71.6

attended five or more years of Catholic elementary school were even more positive in their support, 98 percent. The relative need for Catholic schools today as opposed to the past also showed strong support from the bishops (93%). Once again, there was less support on the part of priests (72%). Priests who had attended five or more years of Catholic elementary school or priests who had never attended a Catholic elementary school agreed with this statement equally (73%). Of those who had attended some Catholic elementary school but less than five years, 52 percent agreed.

A clear majority of the bishops and priests perceived Catholic schools as having a sufficient value to justify their existence both in terms of their relative value compared to the governmental schools and their value today as compared to the past. There was, however, a significant difference between the value placed on the schools by the bishops and that given them by the priests. The priests did not approach the unanimity found among the bishops. One of the 28 percent of the priests who did not see the value of schools today wrote, "Catholic schools are a luxury today. Other ministries often are neglected because of financial burdens caused by Catholic schools." Another priest said that Catholic schools have "lost their identity trying to be like the public schools."

On the other hand, one bishop expressed his thoughts this way: "I believe Catholic schools are more important today than they were in the past. The religious, spiritual dimension is the only significant reason to justify their existence. In my experience, the public schools do an excellent job in academics and extra curricular activities, but the a-religious climate in the public schools makes Catholic schools even more important."

Potential Role of Catholic Schools in Preparing Students for Today's Church and Society

The bishops of the United States clearly saw Catholic schools as having an important part in the mission of the church today (Table 8). All the bishops who responded agreed that the Catholic school forms part of the saving mission of the church, especially for formation and education in the faith. Again, bishops were almost unanimous (99%) in finding that the Catholic school affords the fullest and best opportunity to realize the threefold educational purpose of the church (doctrine, community, service) among children and youth.

Bishops saw the school as serving a critical human need within the context of education (98%), performing an essential service for the church (97%), strengthening the bonds of unity within the parish community (93%). Further, 87 percent of the bishops saw the Catholic school as one of the best means of evangelization in the church today. One bishop summed it up well when he wrote, "Catholic schools still are valuable to the mission of the church. I feel that we should do all that we can to see them continue, for it would be a tragic loss to the church in the United States if they did not."

Although a substantial majority of priests shared the bishop's perceptions of Catholic schools, in general they were not as positive in their understanding of the school's role in the mission of the

TABLE 8—Perception of the Role of Catholic Schools in the Mission of the Church

QUESTIONS	RESPONDENTS	
	BISHOPS AGREED %	PRIESTS AGREED %
That the Catholic school		
Forms part of the church's saving mission	100.0	94.7
Strengthens the bonds of parish unity	92.5	78.4
Is one of the best means of evangelization	87.0	69.2
Serves a critical human need within the context of a complete education	97.7	82.7
Performs an essential service for the church	96.8	83.4
Affords fullest and best opportunity to realize the three-fold purpose of Christian education	98.6	76.2

church today. As Table 8 shows, there were significant differences between bishops' and priests' understanding of the value of Catholic schools. The one place where priests seemed to form near unanimity with bishops was in regard to the Catholic school's being a part of the church's mission of formation and education. As one priest wrote, "In my opinion the strength of the church in this country is due to parochial schools. In my experience, participation of families in the life of the church is greater in parishes with schools." Another said, "The bottom line is that Catholic schools are absolutely necessary for the poor, for our Catholic people, and its sign value for education itself."

The differences became even more noticeable when priests' responses were examined in terms of years of ordination. (Since there was an extremely high correlation for both bishops and priests between years ordained a priest and age, years of ordination to priesthood was used instead of age through the rest of this book). In general the more years a priest has been ordained, the more positively that individual perceived Catholic schools. Those over 30 years were the most positive; those ordained between 11 and 20 years were the least positive. For example, 37 percent of the priests ordained 11 to 20 years did not think that the school is one of the best means of evangelization (Table 9).

TABLE 9—Role of Catholic Schools in the Church's Mission by Priests' Years Ordained

	PRIESTS' YEARS ORDAINED				
ITEMS	10 AND UNDER %	11–20 %	21–30 %	31–40 %	41 AND OVER %
Strengthens the bonds of parish unity	75.0	71.6	77.3	80.8	100.0
Is one of the best means of evangelization	66.2	63.0	66.7	71.6	90.1
Serves a critical human need within context of a complete education	82.4	72.0	82.4	88.6	96.9
Performs an essential service for the church	81.2	70.7	86.5	90.0	97.0
Affords fullest and best opportunity to realize the three-fold purpose of Christian education	71.0	70.0	71.6	85.0	90.9

One priest from this age group wrote, "The Catholic schools can be one effective way of educating children in the faith. They are not an essential way. Unless help comes from the government soon, they cannot stay open." A rather large percentage of the same 11 to 20 group (29%) did not think that the school performs an essential service for the church today. Even the priests ordained ten years and under had considerably more confidence that Catholic schools have a part in the contemporary mission of the church than those ordained 11 to 20 years. This younger group had approximately the same responses as the priests ordained 21 to 30 years.

There were also some significant regional differences in regard to priests' perceptions concerning how schools strengthen the bonds of unity within a parish community and how they perform an essential service for the church. Priests in the Mideast region generally agreed (91%) that Catholic schools strengthen parish unity, as compared to 74 percent for all the other regions in the nation. The priests who most disagreed with this statement came from New England (34%) and the West (32%). The Mideast region also had the highest percentage of priests who agreed that the schools perform an essential service for the church, 93 percent, as compared with 80 percent of the rest of the country. Surprisingly, 80 percent of the New England priests saw schools as providing an essential service even though only 66 percent saw them as contributing to parish unity. The priests in the Southeast and the West with 75 percent and 74 percent respectively had the lowest perceptions of schools as providing essential services to the church (Table C13, Appendix C).

In their 1972 letter, *To Teach As Jesus Did*, the United States bishops listed three essential elements for educational ministry within the church: doctrine, community and service (p. 8). One item in the questionnaire asked bishops and priests if they thought the Catholic schools afforded the fullest and best opportunity to realize this threefold purpose of Christian education for children and youth. The bishops overwhelmingly agreed that it did (99%). The priests were not so certain; only 76 percent of them agreed. Table 10 shows some interesting differences among the priests based on years ordained, years attended Catholic elementary and secondary schools, and whether or not they had been a principal of a Catholic school.

TABLE 10—Priests' Perception that Catholic School Affords the Best Opportunity to Realize the Three-fold Purpose by Ordination, Elementary Attendance, Secondary Attendance and Principalship

	AGREED		DISAGREED	
YEARS ORDAINED	N	%	N	%
10 and under	49	71.0	20	29.0
11–20	56	70.0	24	30.0
21–30	53	71.6	21	28.4
31–40	68	85.0	12	15.0
41 and over	30	90.0	3	9.1
TOTAL	256	76.2	80	23.8
YEARS ATTENDED ELEMENTARY				
None	35	67.3	17	32.7
1–2	6	50.0	6	50.0
3–4	5	45.5	6	54.8
5–8	210	80.5	51	19.5
TOTAL	256	76.2	80	23.8
YEARS ATTENDED SECONDARY				
None	46	67.6	22	32.4
1–2	9	64.3	5	35.7
3–4	200	79.1	53	20.9
TOTAL	255	76.1	80	23.9
PRINCIPAL				
Yes	27	90.0	3	10.0
No	225	74.5	77	25.5
TOTAL	252	75.9	80	24.1

Priests ordained under 31 years were consistent in their responses. Approximately 71 percent of the priests ordained under 31 years agreed that Catholic schools are the best way to fulfill the threefold purpose of Catholic education. For those ordained 31 years and over, the percentage rose to 87.

Priests who attended Catholic elementary schools for five years or more had a significantly higher positive view about Catholic schools' possibilities than priests who did not attend

and priests who attended for only a few years. Those attending five years or more had a positive response rate of 81 percent. The priests who attended a Catholic secondary school for three or more years also had a high positive response rate (79%). As might be expected, 90 percent of those priests who were principals of Catholic schools responded that they thought Catholic schools afforded the fullest opportunity to realize the threefold purpose of Catholic education.

When there were questions regarding outreach or curriculum for justice, bishops saw the schools playing a more active role in the society than did the priests. Table 11 shows that bishops were significantly more in favor of schools' educating the economically and culturally deprived, of schools' having their leadership seek to integrate the schools more fully and of schools' emphasizing education for justice and authentic liberation. The bishops seemed more in tune with the reality since across the nation 21 percent of all Catholic school students are minority students (*United States*, 1986, p. 15).

TABLE 11—Perception of the Role of Catholic Schools in Preparing Students for Today's Church and Society

	RESPONDENTS	
QUESTIONS	BISHOPS AGREED %	PRIESTS AGREED %
That the Catholic school should		
Educate those who suffer from economic deprivation or discrimination based on race or linguistic difference	92.0	76.2
Make integration a major priority	87.8	70.6
Emphasize education for justice and authentic human liberation	88.7	75.7

In terms of educating the economically and culturally deprived, those priests assigned to the inner-city saw the schools as playing the greatest role in this area (91%). Those in urban areas agreed at almost the same rate (83%) while 72 percent of the suburban priests and 68 percent of the rural priests agreed (Table C14, Appendix C).

Of those who agreed that Catholic schools should make integration a priority, the largest percentage (87%) came from those who had never served in a parish with a school. The percentage diminished as the number of years of ministry in a parish with a school rose, down to 60 percent for those who had served between six and ten years. The percentage rose again to 67 percent for those who had served 11 years or more in a Catholic school. With the exception of the last group, it seemed that those who had the least experience with Catholic schools wished them to make integration a priority. Perhaps, it is a lack of knowledge of what Catholic schools have done in the past (Table C15, Appendix C).

Education for justice has been a major concern of Catholic schools for the past ten years. One sign of this concern was that the National Catholic Educational Association has a department for Justice and Peace Education. A large percentage of the bishops (89%) wished the schools could increase their attention to education for justice and authentic liberation; so did those priests ordained 11 to 20 years (85%). They and the priests ordained 41 years and over (87%) agreed that increased attention must be given to this area (Table C16, Appendix C).

It is ironic that the 11 to 20 years ordained group, the one with the largest percentage of disagreement (30%) over the schools' affording the best opportunity to realize the threefold purpose of education should expect those same schools to increase emphasis on justice education. The key word may be "increased." Only 70 percent of those who taught in Catholic schools see this as a great need, possibly because of their experience of having taught justice and peace issues in Catholic schools (Table C16, Appendix C).

In general priests and bishops were very strong in their affirmation of the value of Catholic schools. There was, however, a significant disparity between the priests and bishops in their regard for schools; the younger clergy, especially those ordained 11 to 20 years, had the least regard for the value of the schools.

CHAPTER 5

The Effectiveness of Catholic Schools

The continued success of Catholic schools is in many ways dependent on how well they do their job. Perhaps, more especially their strength depends on how well people perceive their effectiveness. As mentioned before, the consumers of the school tend to vote with their feet, giving clear indications of their perceptions. The sponsors of the schools do not have the same ways to express their perceptions. Therefore, it was important to discover how bishops and priests viewed the effectiveness of Catholic elementary and secondary schools.

In this study the effort to assess how priests and bishops viewed effectiveness was based on questions which centered on the educational programs of the schools and the impact these programs have on students. The respondents answered items concerning the academic quality of the schools and the effectiveness of the program in terms of student formation. Additional questions dealt with the adequacy of current religious education programs (CCD) as alternatives to schools.

Quality of Education Programs in Catholic Schools

A high percentage of the bishops and priests agreed that the quality of Catholic schools in their areas was generally satisfactory. The bishops had a very high percentage of agreement (96%). As Table 12 shows, the priests had a statistically significant lower level (89%).

TABLE 12—Quality of Education Programs in Catholic Schools

QUESTIONS	RESPONDENTS	
	BISHOPS AGREED %	PRIESTS AGREED %
Quality of Catholic school generally satisfactory	95.9	88.7
Catholic elementary schools academically better than public	88.8	79.3
Catholic secondary academically better than public secondary	89.2	80.7

When the location of priests' assignments was taken into account, the perception changed. Only 76 percent of the priests in the inner city thought that the quality of Catholic schools was satisfactory while 96 percent of priests in urban locations and 92 percent of priests in suburban locations thought they were (Table 13). Perhaps this difference reflected the common perception that inner city schools are not as good as the rest of the nation's schools. When the number of years in a Catholic elementary school was taken into account, there was a major difference in one category. Only 60 percent of those who have attended Catholic elementary schools for four years or less thought that the general quality of the schools was satisfactory as compared to approximately 90 percent for all other categories including those priests who had never attended a Catholic elementary schools.

Bishops and priests strongly supported the notion (89 and 79 percent respectively) that Catholic elementary schools were

TABLE 13—Priests' Perceptions of Satisfactory Quality of Schools

QUESTIONS	LOCATION OF ASSIGNMENT			
	INNER CITY	URBAN	SUB-URBAN	RURAL
Agreed that				
Quality of Catholic schools generally satisfactory	75.9	96.4	92.4	86.1
Catholic elementary schools academically better than public schools	92.5	84.3	70.9	76.4

academically better than the public schools in their areas (Table 12). There was, however, a significant difference between the perceptions of the bishops and the priests. Although a large majority of priests were supportive, 21 percent did not think that Catholic schools surpass the public schools in academic quality. As one priest put it, "Catholic schools have lost their identity to be like public schools." Another said, "We are trying to compete too much with public schools in academics and sports. There should be a greater emphasis on religious education and spiritual values. Get the sisters back into teaching our kids." More than academic quality may have been at stake here. One priest wrote, "Those high school should turn out christian leaders which they are not doing in my area. I wonder if they even produce christians. We need to turn it all around."

There were also some significant differences about the academic quality of elementary schools among the bishops in terms of the number of years they had been ordained priests (Table C17, Appendix C). Bishops in the 21 to 30 years ordained category (ages 46 through 55) showed an agreement of 82 percent as compared to 100 percent for the 11 to 20 years ordained group, 89 for the 31 to 40 and 98 percent for the bishops ordained 41 years and over.

What was true of elementary schools was also generally true of secondary schools as Table 12 indicates. The percentages were almost exactly the same for the overall groups. There was a slight shift in the 21 to 30 years ordained group of bishops in a comparison of Catholic to public secondary schools; 85 percent thought that Catholic secondary schools were better than public secondary schools (Table C18, Appendix C).

For the priests, agreement with this statement changed according to years of ordination. For those ordained under 10 years, only 75 percent agreed that Catholic secondary schools are better than public secondary schools. In the 11 to 20 years ordained group, only 70 percent agreed; in the 21 to 30, 80 percent; in the 31 to 40, 93 percent; and in the 41 and over, 90. Over 25 percent of the younger clergy did not see Catholic secondary schools as surpassing public schools academically (Table C18, Appendix C).

Effectiveness of Formation Programs in the Lives of Students

Several items on the questionnaire measured priests' and bishops' perceptions concerning the effectiveness of school formation programs and the relative value of attending a Catholic school in regard to long-term effects on adult Christian behavior.

As Table 14 shows, only 21 percent of the bishops and 47 percent of the priests agreed that the kind of school people attend makes no difference in their lives. Thus, 79 percent of the bishops and 53 percent of the priests agreed that attendance at Catholic schools does help the individual become a better adult Catholic. Bishops who have been Catholic superintendents of schools differed widely from the other bishops in this regard; only 63 percent of them agreed that Catholic schools produce better Catholics than public schools as compared to 82 percent of the remaining bishops.

The perceptions of priests varied in regard to the differences between Catholic schools and governmental schools when years of ordination was taken into account. Only 45 percent of those ordained 10 years and under agreed, rising to 57 percent of those ordained 31 to 40 years and 75 percent for those ordained 41 years and over.

Bishops and priests differed significantly in their perceptions concerning Catholic secondary schools. Although 80 per-

TABLE 14—Effectiveness of School Formation Programs

QUESTIONS	RESPONDENTS: BISHOPS AGREED %	RESPONDENTS: PRIESTS AGREED %
Generally Catholics who go to public schools turn out to be as good as Catholics who went to Catholic schools	20.7	46.7
Catholic secondary schools form convinced, articulate Catholics for today's society	79.9	50.5
Catholic schools have a positive impact on adult religious behavior of graduate	97.2	84.4

cent of the bishops thought that Catholic secondary schools form convinced articulate Catholics who can take their places in contemporary society, only 51 percent of the priests agreed. In both cases, the agreement was across the board. There were no significant differences based on years of ordination, attendance at Catholic elementary school or any other factors. Administrators and teachers of Catholic secondary schools face a serious problem if half of the nations' priests think that their schools are not producing convinced, articulate Catholics ready to take their places in society. It could be, however, that many bishops and priests did not think that any person who has just graduated from high school is capable of taking his or her place in the society.

When faced with the question as to whether Catholic schools have a positive impact on adult religious behavior of their graduates, 97 percent of the bishops and 84 percent of the priests agreed. The bishops from the top ten states agreed at a high rate 94 percent, but 100 percent of the bishops in the other 40 states agreed.

How priests viewed the positive impact of Catholic schools on adult religious behavior varied according to several conditions. Years ordained, years in a parish with a school and the region of the country all seemed to have some effect on priests perceptions (Table 15). Once again, priests ordained 11 to 20 years had a statistically significantly lower perception on the effectiveness of Catholic schools than did other priests. Of that group 76 percent agreed with the positive perception as opposed to 87 percent of the remainder of the priests.

Years in a parish with a school also made a difference. Only 64 percent of those priests who had never been in a parish with a Catholic school thought that Catholic schools had a positive impact on religious behavior while 91 percent of the other priests did. Regionally, the major differences occured in New England and the West. The New England priests were significantly lower than the others 74 percent, followed by the West at 77 percent. The Mideast and the Plains had the highest number of positive responses from priests at 93 percent and 88 percent. Overall, priests and bishops did see Catholic schools as having a positive impact on adult religious behavior.

TABLE 15—Priests' Perceptions of the Positive Impact of Catholic Schools on the Adult Religious Behavior of Their Graduates

YEARS ORDAINED	AGREED N	AGREED %	DISAGREED N	DISAGREED %
10 and under	55	80.9	13	13.8
11–20	62	75.6	20	24.4
21–30	62	84.9	11	15.1
31–40	71	89.9	8	10.1
41 and over	31	100.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	282	84.4	52	15.6
$\chi^2 = 13.20, p < .05$				
YEARS IN PARISH WITH SCHOOL				
None	16	64.0	9	36.0
1–5	69	89.6	8	10.4
6–10	60	84.5	11	15.4
11 or more	136	85.0	24	15.0
TOTAL	281	84.4	52	15.6
$\chi^2 = 9.53, p < .05$				
REGIONS				
New England	25	73.5	9	26.5
Mideast	80	93.0	6	7.0
Great Lakes	64	82.1	14	17.9
Plains	37	88.1	5	11.9
Southeast	32	86.5	5	13.5
West	44	77.2	13	22.8
TOTAL	282	84.4	52	15.6
$\chi^2 = 11.06, p < .05$				

Potential of Religious Education Programs (CCD) for Adequate Formation of Students

No one knows the exact number of elementary and secondary aged students in parish religious education programs. The estimates run approximately four million with another five to eight million students who are neither in parish catechetical programs or in Catholic schools (Thompson and Hemrick, 1982, p. 23). Because so many

Catholic young people are in parish catechetical programs, the way these programs were viewed by bishops and priests is extremely important.

A large majority of the bishops (87%) did not see parish religious education programs as effective in training young Catholics as Catholic schools have been. One bishop wrote, "I am obviously Catholic school oriented. The past 25 years have made it clear that the CCD approach is not effective." Another bishop said, "There is no adequate substitute for a truly Catholic school." One priest said, "There is no doubt that CCD is a very poor gap-filler for the faith." Other priests think that religious education programs need attention. They "need to be reinforced and also need active support from parents." Several priests thought that religious education programs outside of schools "have not been given equal budget money and have not reached their potential. We need professional religious education people."

A significantly smaller number of the priests, 68 percent, shared the perception that religious education programs will ever be as good as Catholic schools (Table 16). A majority of the bishops (74%) and again a significantly smaller number of the priests (62%) thought that it is impossible for the church to provide adequate religious and moral formation for public high school students with the present catechetical programs (Table 16).

In regard to the effectiveness of parish religious education programs compared to schools, years of ordination for both bishops and priests made a difference. According to Table 17, only 55 percent of the youngest bishops agreed that religious education programs will never be as effective as Catholic schools. The priests' agreement also seemed to follow years of ordination with the 11 to

TABLE 16—Potential for Religious Education (CCD) for Adequate Formation of Students

QUESTIONS	RESPONDENTS	
	BISHOPS AGREED %	PRIESTS AGREED %
Religious education programs (CCD) will never be as effective as Catholic schools	87.2	68.3
Present catechetical programs for high school students cannot provide adequate formation	74.0	61.6

TABLE 17—Perceptions that Religious Education Programs Will Never Be as Effective as Catholic Schools

QUESTIONS	RESPONDENTS	
	BISHOPS AGREED %	PRIESTS AGREED %
10 and under	–	58.0
11–20	55.6	56.0
21–30	84.6	72.0
31–40	88.4	79.2
41 and over	95.7	87.5
YEARS ATTENDED CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL		
None	–	55.7
1–2	–	64.3
3–4	–	72.0
TAUGHT IN CATHOLIC SCHOOL		
Yes	–	77.4
No	–	62.6

20 year period showing a low of 56 percent followed closely by those ordained under 10 years at 58 percent. Both younger bishops and younger clergy had a greater trust in the possibilities of religious education programs outside of schools than the rest of the clergy.

For the priests, having attended a Catholic secondary school seemed to have had some effect. The longer the person attended a Catholic secondary school, the less likely he was to see the possibilities of programs outside of schools. Teaching in a Catholic school had a similar effect. The priests who taught full-time in a Catholic school tended to think that religious education programs would never match the school, 77 percent as compared to 63 percent of those who had not taught.

The possibility of the church's providing adequate religious and moral formation for public high school students with the present catechetical programs drew similar responses. Only 22

percent of the bishops who had attended a Catholic elementary school saw the possibility of adequate programs compared to 47 percent for those bishops who had not been to a Catholic elementary school.

Of the bishops who had taught fulltime in Catholic schools, 35 percent saw the possibility of present programs providing adequate formation while 21 percent of those who had not taught thought that present catechetical programs for high school youth were adequate (Table C19, Appendix C). Of the priests who taught, 31 percent agreed with the adequacy as compared to 43 percent of those who had never taught. The priests who were pastors agreed at the rate of 45 percent that it is possible to provide adequate formation for high school students as compared to 28 percent of the rest of the priests.

Although a majority of priests and bishops did not think the present secondary religious education programs are adequate, there was no clear indication of why they think that way. In fact, there are some conflicting indicators. Pastors seem to be more hopeful that parish programs will succeed than do bishops or other priests.

CHAPTER 6

Funding Practices for Catholic Schools

Money has always been an important issue in Catholic schools. There has not been a time in the nation's history when Catholics have not had to sacrifice to keep the schools alive. The same thing is true today; rising costs continue to plague the schools.

Compared to public school salaries, teacher salaries in Catholic schools are low. In some dioceses sisters continue to get stipends rather than comparable salaries. Although these relatively low salaries and other personnel costs account for at least 75 percent of the schools' budgets, salaries are generally low in Catholic schools. That situation is gradually changing. Lay teachers are demanding higher salaries; sisters can no longer live off of small stipends. Religious communities have new needs, for example, retirement costs which have increased dramatically in the past decade as the number of active sisters in proportion to the number of retired sisters shrinks.

Many schools in urban areas are old and the cost of maintaining these schools is an increasing burden. Some dioceses have started major capital improvement programs which further increase the cost of Catholic schooling. While the whole movement toward development for Catholic schools has eased the burden somewhat, those closest to Catholic school finances continue to struggle with raising enough money to keep the schools in quality operation.

In the last 15 years, per pupil costs for Catholic schools have increased almost 300 percent. Tuition has increased even faster. It now accounts for 43 percent of revenue as compared to 39 percent 12 years ago. Parish subsidy has decreased even more during that

same period, 53 percent to 46 percent (*United States*, 1984, pp. 6-7). Part of the reason for the decrease is that contributions to the church have not kept pace with the rise in school costs and many parishes are reluctant to spend a major portion of their ordinary income on parish schools. For all of these reasons it is important to know how bishops and pastors perceive the whole question of funding.

Priests and bishops answered nine questions on financial matters. Four dealt with the perceptions of present financial practices, four with the question of future financial expectations and one with the relationship between tuition and school selection.

Perceptions of Present Financial Practices

When it came to the question of how Catholic schools should be financed, bishops and priests had significantly divergent views. Table 18 indicates that a majority of the bishops, 74 percent, thought that the policy of each parish's financing its own school was still the best, while a slim majority of the priests, 57 percent, agreed with that statement.

When years of ordination to priesthood was taken into account, the differences became even more dramatic. Only 22 percent of the youngest bishops in the nation, those ordained under 20 years, agreed that each parish should finance its own school; the largest percentage of agreement came from bishops ordained 31 to 40 years, 84 percent (Table C20, Appendix C).

Years ordained also made a difference in regard to priests. Those ordained under 30 years were split almost evenly on the question of the parishs' financing the schools. Of those ordained 31 to 40 years, 67 percent agreed and 88 percent of those ordained over 40 years agreed (Table 20, Appendix C).

Priests also differed on this question according to region. Only 36 percent of the New England priests thought that parishes should continure to finance their own schools. Priests in the Mideast and Great Lakes agreed by a slim majority; those in the Southeast and West agreed 64 and 61 percent respectively. Priests in the Plains states agreed most completely with this statement at 74 percent (Table C20, Appendix C).

For bishops a significant difference occurred in regard to the number of years they spent in a parish with a school. Only

38percent of those who have no experience in a parish with a school agreed. Over 70 percent of those with 10 years or less experience agreed and 84 percent of those with 11 or more years agreed (Table C20, Appendix C). It is in the matter of money that bishops and priests differ the most.

TABLE 18—Perceptions of Present Financial Practices

QUESTIONS	RESPONDENTS	
	BISHOPS AGREED %	PRIESTS AGREED %
Each parish should continue to finance its own school	74.2	56.4
Parish contribution to the operational cost of the elementary school should not exceed 40 percent of per pupil cost	52.6	68.7
Catholic schools make effective use of the church's resources	91.7	66.2
Catholic schools use a disproportionate amount of parish revenue for the number of parishioners served	53.2	73.1

How much the parish should subsidize the cost of the elementary school is shown in Table 18. One question attempted to determine if bishops and priests thought there should be limits to a parish's contribution. It asked if there should be a cap on the subsidy from parish ordinary income of 40 percent of the annual per pupil cost. Of the bishops responding, 53 percent agreed that parishes should limit their contribution while 69 percent of the priests agreed. The question itself may have been confusing; it was the longest in the questionnaire.

One indication of the problem connected with the question was that 11 percent of the bishops and priests did not answer it. Nevertheless, it does indicate that a majority of the priests and bishops would put limits on what a parish can contribute to an elementary school. As one priest commented, "I see the schools taking a disproportionate amount of parish financiing, turning out at least 50 percent lukewarm Catholics, and often causing dissension within the parish." Other dioceses are making positve

financial efforts. Several bishops wrote that they had estabalished educational trust funds to help the Catholic schools especially those in poor areas.

How the priests and bishops responded regionally points to the difference funding practices around the country. A large percentage of the bishops and priests in New England and the West (over 70%) agreed that there should be limits, while the priests and bishops in the Plains States generally did not agree. Only 31.0 percent of the bishops and 38.9 percent of the priests in the Plains agreed. This low agreement perhaps reflects the high per pupil cost in that region. The bishops and priests may fear that without large church subsidy parents could not afford Catholic schools for their children (*United States*, 1984, p. 7 and Table C21, Appendix C).

A possibility for conflict was found in the Mideast and Great Lakes. There was a great divergence between the bishops' perceptions and the priests'. Only 42 percent of the bishops in the Mideast and 38 percent of the bishops in the Great Lakes agreed that there should be some restrictions on parish contributions, while 77 percent of the priests in the Mideast and 64 percent of the priests in the Great Lakes agreed. The people closest to the place where the money has to be raised seem more concerned about how it should be spent than those further away.

There were also significant differences among the bishops when years or ordination, attendance in Catholic elementary school and years in a parish with a school were considered. In general, the longer a bishop has been ordained, the less likely he was to want restrictions on the percentage of parish income that should go to the Catholic school. Of those ordained 21 to 30 years, 68 percent agreed, while 29 percent of those ordained 41 years or more agreed. The youngest bishops formed an exception since only 56 percent of them agreed with the statement (Table 22, Appendix C).

Attendance at the Catholic elementary school for 5 years or more also made a difference. Less than 50 percent of the bishops who had attended a Catholic school for 5 years or more agreed with the statement while 66 percent who had never attended a Catholic elementary school agreed. There were also differences when the years spent in a parish with a school were taken into consideration. In regard to the number of years in a school, 44

percent of those with 5 years or less experience agreed, 72 percent of those bishops with six to 10 years agreed and 43 percent of those with 11 or more years agreed that there should be restrictions on subsidy. A much larger percentage of bishops who had never been in a parish with a school agreed (71%).

Priests in the ten largest Catholic school states gave considerably different responses to the question of subsidy. Of the priests in the top ten states, 74 percent agreed on limits while only 61 percent of the priests in the other 40 states agreed (Table C22, Appendix C).

The next two issues concerned whether or not Catholic schools make effective use of the church's financial resources and whether they use a disproportionate amount of parish revenue for the number of parishioners served. A very large majority of the bishops, 92 percent, agreed that Catholic schools do use the church's financial resources effectively (Table 18).

That agreement varied slightly according to the number of years ordained a priest. Of those ordained 41 years and over, 100 percent agreed; 31 to 40 years, 95 percent; 21 to 30 years, 83 percent; and 11 to 20 years, 89 percent. A statistically significant number of bishops in the 46 to 55 year old bracket did not see the schools as making effective use of church resources (Table C23, Appendix C).

Fully 25 percent fewer priests than bishops thought that Catholic schools effectively use the church's money (Table 18). Only 66 percent of the priests as compared to 92 percent of the bishops agreed. The highest agreement at 78 percent came from priests whose ministry was in urban areas while the lowest agreement, 60 percent, was from priests in the inner city. Given their recent peace and justice emphasis in the church, it might be true that over 40 percent of the inner city priests view the schools as siphoning off money that could be used for other inner city ministries (Table C23, Appendix C). As one inner city priest put it, "In an ideal world, Catholic schools would be wonderful, but they bleed a parish dry leaving no money for any other programs."

Bishops certainly agreed that Catholic schools effectively use the church's money and two-thirds of the priests did. However, as Table 19 shows, 53 percent of the bishops and 73 percent

TABLE 19—Catholic Schools Use a Disproportionate Amount of Parish Revenue for the Number of Parishioners Served

YEARS ORDAINED	RESPONDENTS: BISHOPS AGREED %	RESPONDENTS: PRIESTS AGREED %
10 and under	–	68.2
11–20	77.8	74.1
21–30	69.2	85.3
31–40	41.9	70.1
41 and over	42.2	59.4
TOTAL	53.2	73.1

of the priests thought that Catholic schools use a disproportionate amount of parish revenue considering the number of parishioners served by the school. For bishops, there were significant differences when years of ordination to priesthood was considered. The longer a bishop had been ordained, the more likely he was to disagree with the statement. For priests, 85 percent of those ordained 21 to 30 years agreed and 74 percent of those ordained 11 to 20 years agreed that Catholic schools use too much parish money.

Table 20 points out that there were significant differences in the way bishops and priests responded based on other factors. Bishops who had never attended Catholic elementary schools were 10 percent higher than the other bishops in their agreement that the schools use too much parish money. Only 31 percent of the bishops who had been superintendents of schools agreed.

There were also differences among the priests. Pastors differed significantly from other priests in their agreement with this statement, 78 percent as compared to 65 percent. Perhaps, because pastors were more concerned about parish finances than other priests, they saw the schools as a major drain on resourses. Priests who were members of religious communities were significantly less in agreement with the statement than diocesan priests. Only 64 percent of the religious community priests thought that the schools use too much parish money. Not sur-

TABLE 20—Catholic Schools Use a Disproportionate Amount of Parish Revenue for Number of Parishioners Served

ACTIVITY	RESPONDENTS BISHOPS AGREED %
No Catholic elementary school	59.5
5–8 years Catholic elementary school	50.0
Superintendent of schools	50.8
	PRIESTS AGREED %
Pastors	78.2
All others	64.5
Member of religious community	63.5
Diocesan priest	75.3
Taught in Catholic school	64.6
Did not teach	78.3

prisingly, those who have taught fulltime in a Catholic school were less likely to say the schools use too much money, 65 percent, than those who had never taught in a Catholic school, 78 percent.

Thus, almost the entire population of bishops and a large majority of the priests thought that Catholic schools are an effective way to use the church's financial resources. However, both groups also thought that the schools use a disproportionately large amount.

Future Financial Expectations

Bishops and priests disagreed on how effectively Catholic schools use the church's money and continue to disagree on where that money should come from. In regard to who should support Catholic schools, 96 percent of the bishops and 79 percent of the priests agreed that the financial support of Catholic schools is the duty of all Catholics whether or not they have children in Catholic schools. Only a few priests thought that the schools should be financed by the parents who want them (Table 21).

TABLE 21—Future Financial Expectations

	RESPONDENTS	
	BISHOPS AGREED %	PRIESTS AGREED %
The financial support of Catholic schools is the duty of all Catholics whether or not they have children in Catholic schools	95.9	79.2
General subsidies to parishes with schools should be eliminated in favor of a diocesan scholarship fund	40.3	75.1
An annual diocesan education collection for Catholic schools should be established	45.1	45.5
Lay teachers should sacrifice financial gain in order to provide some "contributed services"	58.2	42.9

Traditionally, Catholic schools have been seen as the responsibility of the whole church. There seemed to have been a divergence among the bishops and priests. This difference was especially noticeable on a regional basis. For example, in New England only 14 percent of the bishops but 71 percent of the priests agreed that everyone has an obligation to support Catholic schools. In the Great Lakes, the Plains and the Southeast, 100 percent of the bishops agreed with the statement, while only 78 percent of the priests in the Great Lakes, 91 percent of those in the Plains and 63 percent of those in the Southeast agreed. This wide divergence is a potential cause for future problems (Table C24, Appendix C).

Priests differed widely but predictably on this question of total church responsibility for schools when years of ordination were taken into account. Only 71.8 percent of those ordained 11 to 20 years and 75 percent of those ordained 21 to 30 years agreed. For those ordained under 10 years and over 30 years, the agreement rate was significantly higher. Pastors agreed less with the statement than did associates, those in team ministry and those in non-parish ministry. Only 75 percent of the pastors agreed that the financial support of the school is the responsibility of the entire community. Those who have attended 3 or more years of Catholic secondary school agreed at a much higher rate than other priests, 84 percent, compared to 71 per-

cent for those who had never attended a Catholic secondary school and 57 percent for those who had attended less than three years (Table C25, Appendix C).

Although large percentages of priests and bishops did agree that the responsibility of supporting Catholic schools belongs to the entire community, when it came to specific recommendations that agreement lessened. As Table 21 shows, less than 50 percent of the bishops and priests thought that general subsidies to parishes with schools that cannot finance them should be eliminated in favor of a diocesan scholarship program for all students based solely on demonstrated need. Most dioceses do support poor parishes, many in the form of block grants. Both bishops and priests seemed to prefer this kind of subsidy rather than a scholarship fund administered by the diocese.

Bishops differed markedly among themselves by region of the country they come from as did the priests. It is not possible to know what causes all this divergence, although the presumption is that local funding practices are at the root of it. The only section of the country where there may be some potential conflict was in the Great Lakes region where 30 percent of the bishops agreed that there should be a diocesan scholarship fund while 58 percent of the priests agreed (Table C26, Appendix C).

The idea of an annual diocesan collection for Catholic schools did not fare much better. Less than 50 percent of the bishops and priests thought that such a collection was in the best interest of the church.

As Table 22 shows, however, there were differences of opinion based on years of ordination. Both bishops and priests who have been ordained 21 to 30 years showed the lowest agreement with a notion of a diocesan education collection. Bishops ordained between 11 and 20 years showed the highest level of agreement, 98 percent, followed by bishops ordained over 40 years, 52 percent, and priests ordained over 40 years, and under 11 years, 65 and 55 percent respectively. The motivations behind these perceptions are obscure. It may be that priests and bishops of different age groups are more committed to Catholic schools or it may be that they see a diocesan collection as a way of removing an undue burden from the parish. Those who disagreed may dislike diocesan collections in general.

The question may also be one of local autonomy. Surprisingly, only 39 percent of pastors thought that there should be a diocesan collection as compared to 50 percent of associates, 90 percent of priests in team ministry and 52 percent of priests in non-parish ministry. It would seem that pastors would welcome the added financial help, although it may be that they do not wish the control that comes with diocesan money (Table C27, Appendix C).

There were also significant differences on the question of a diocesan collection based on whether or not the priests had ever attended a Catholic elementary school. Those who had attended five or more years agreed at a higher rate (46%)than those who had never attended Catholic schools (35%).

Number of years in a parish also made a significant difference in regard to a diocesan collection. Those who had never served in a parish with a school agreed at 42 percent, those with five years or less at 67 percent, while at 6 to 10 years or less 33 percent agreed and 11 years or more at 42 percent. It is difficult to interpret the meaning of these percentages. It could be that they represent age differences or that younger clergy tend to be in inner city or urban parishes with greater financial problems. There were, however, no significant correlations between years in a parish with a school and age, years ordained, or location of parish assignment.

Regional differences showed the greatest divergence of views. Almost three-quarters of the priests in New England, 71 percent, wanted a diocesan collection for Catholic schools, whereas the priests in the rest of the country viewed such a collection with less enthusiasm (Table C27, Appendix C).

TABLE 22—An Annual Diocesan Education Collection for Catholic Schools Should be Established

	RESPONDENTS	
YEARS ORDAINED	BISHOPS AGREED %	PRIESTS AGREED %
10 and under	–	55.1
11–20	88.9	47.6
21–30	33.8	34.2
31–40	47.0	38.5
41 and over	52.3	64.5

Bishops and priests split on the question of whether lay teachers should be willing to accept a lower salary than they would receive in another school system to teach in a Catholic school (Table 21). The bishops agreed at the rate of 58 percent that lay teachers should give some "contributed services", while only 43 percent of the priests agreed.

Priests split among themselves strictly according to years of ordination, that is, 59 percent of those ordained 41 years or more agreed, 51 percent of those 31 to 40, 46.1 percent of those ordained 21 to 30, 37 percent of those 11 to 20 and 30 percent of those ordained 10 years and under agreed (Table C28, Appendix C). The priests also split along the lines of role. The pastors agreed with the statement by a slim majority of just over 50 percent, while only 30 percent of all the other priests agreed.

The longer a priest was in a parish with a Catholic school, the more he tended to agreed that lay teachers should give "contributed services." Diocesan priests agreed with the statement at the rate of 47 percent and priests in a religious community only 27 percent (Table C28, Appendix C). Age and years of experience played a definite role in how priests saw current compensation for lay teachers. Those with the greatest amount of experience expected the most in "contributed services."

Judgment on Relationships Between Tuition and School Selection

Why parents choose Catholic schools for their children is an important issue for the Catholic community; why they do not choose them is also equally important. One of the reasons usually given is the amount of tuition. One question asked whether tuition was the main reason why parents do not select Catholic schools for their children where those schools are available. Bishops and priests showed unusual unanimity on this question; 59 percent of the bishops and 58 of the priests agreed with the statement (Table 23). A majority of the bishops and priests did see tuition as a major problem and the major reason for selectivity for Catholic school students. For the priests, the closer to the core city they were, the more they saw tuition as a problem. Of the inner city priests, 71 percent agreed as compared to only 48 percent of the rural priests.

Priests and bishops were generally not in agreement on the whole question of Catholic school finances. There were large div-

ergencies by region, years of ordination and parish assignment. If the sponsors of the schools do not agree on these vital issues, it will be difficult for schools to reach financial security.

TABLE 23—Judgment on the Relationship between Tuition and School Selection

	RESPONDENTS	
	BISHOPS AGREED %	PRIESTS AGREED %
Tuition is the main reason parents do not choose Catholic schools for their children	59.0	58.3

CHAPTER 7

Future Structures of Catholic Schools

Part of this study concerned priests' and bishops' perceptions of possible future structures for Catholic schools. Of the 14 questions in this area, three addressed alternative education models outside of schools, four addressed alternative structures for schools, three addressed regionalization and centralization of schools, and four staffing and authority issues.

Alternative Non-school Models

Bishops and priests clearly rejected the notion that improved religious education programs outside of schools (CCD) should eventually replace Catholic schools. As Table 24 shows, only 8 percent of the bishops and 29 percent of the priests agreed with the statement that religious education outside of schools can replace Catholic school education.

Diocesan bishops had an even lower acceptance rate, 5 percent, than auxiliary bishops, 12 percent. There was also a significant difference between bishops who attended Catholic college for four years or more and bishops who had never attended a Catholic college. Those who graduated from Catholic college agreed that CCD programs should eventually replace Catholic schools at a rate of 23 percent, while bishops who never attended a Catholic college only agreed at 7 percent (Table C30, Appendix C).

The composite rating for priests on this issue of religious education programs replacing Catholic schools was 29 percent. Pastors had a significantly higher rate (33%) than did all of the other priests (22%). This higher agreement among pastors might reflect the fact that they have to deal with the finances of Catholic schools more than other priests do (Table C30, Appendix C).

The next item on alternative models dealt with the notion that if Catholic schools do not receive public aid within the next three years, the dioceses should gradually close all schools and have each parish concentrate on other forms of religious education. Only 8 percent of the bishops and 26 percent of the priests agreed with that statement (Table 24). An even lower number of diocesan bishops agreed, 5 percent as compared to 12 percent of auxiliary bishops.

TABLE 24—Alternative Education Models Outside of Schools

	RESPONDENTS	
	BISHOPS AGREED %	PRIESTS AGREED %
Improved CCD programs should eventually replace Catholic schools	7.8	28.8
If there is no public aid within three years, the diocese should close all schools and concentrate on other forms of religious education	7.8	26.2
Make a major investment in adult religious education even if it means a cutback in school programs	29.2	49.6

Mideast and Western bishops agreed with the statement about closing schools if there is no federal aid at a higher percentage than the national norm, 18 percent for the Mideast and 13 for the West. These higher numbers probably reflect financial concerns for Catholic schools in these sections of the country. No bishops in the Plains or the Southeast agreed, and only 2 percent of the bishops in the Great Lakes region agreed (Table C31, Appendix C).

Not suprisingly, only 20 percent of the priests who had taught in Catholic schools as compared to 31 percent of those

who had not taught agreed that religious education programs should replace Catholic schools. Priests in the top ten states agreed with the statement at a rate of 31 percent as compared to 20 percent for the priests of the other 40 states, perhaps again reflecting financial concerns (Table C31, Appendix C).

The percentage of agreement changed upward when priests and bishops were asked about the diocese's making a major investment in adult religious education programs even if that meant a cutback in school programs. In this case, 29 percent of the bishops and 50 percent of the priests agreed with the statement (Table 24). Once again, years of ordination made a difference. The youngest bishops had the highest percentage of agreement at 44 percent. Bishops ordained 31 to 40 years agreed at 41 percent. Since this age group (56 to 65) comprises 41 percent of the active bishops, their perceptions skewed the national average. Younger bishops apparently put a lot more emphasis on adult religious education than did bishops ordained 31 years or more (Table C32, Appendix C).

Bishops who had attended Catholic elementary schools for five years or more only agreed with the statement about adult religious education at a rate of 23 percent while those who had never attended Catholic elementary school agreed at 44 percent. Bishops in New England agreed with the statement at the lowest rate, 8 percent, followed by the bishops in the Southeast at 20 percent. The bishops in the West agreed at 45 percent (Table C33, Appendix C).

For priests, a significant difference on this question was whether or not they had attended a Catholic secondary school for three or more years. Of those who had attended, 47 percent agreed with the statement, while 59 percent of those who had never attended a Catholic secondary school agreed. Similar percentages were found among those priests who had taught in the Catholic school, where 43 percent of those agreed while 53 of those who had never taught agreed. The difference was even more striking in regard to principalship. Of those priests who were principals, only 32 percent agreed while 51 percent of those who were not principals of a Catholic school agreed (Table C33, Appendix C).

In regard to alternative educational models outside of Catholic schools, it seemed that bishops and priests clearly rejected

the notion that there are other forms of religious education capable of supplanting the Catholic school. Approximately 20 percent more bishops were convinced of this statement than priests. When it came to adult religious education, a larger percentage of the bishops favored it even if it meant cutting back on Catholic schools. As was previously indicated, the priests were split almost evenly on this question.

Alternative Structures for Schools

Priests and bishops had very definite ideas about alternative structures for Catholic schools. Although their thoughts were not always in agreement, one thing they did agree on was that if it were necessary that Catholic schools should close some grades, the secondary grades should be closed before the elementary grades. Bishops and priests overwhelmingly reject the notion that elementary grades should be closed first (Table 25). On the other hand, 57 percent of the bishops and 68 percent of the priests agreed that the secondary grades should be closed first.

TABLE 25—Alternative Structures for Schools

	RESPONDENTS	
	BISHOPS AGREED %	PRIESTS AGREED %
If some grades have to close, the elementary grades (1–8) should be closed first	10.3	15.4
If some grades have to close, the secondary grades (9–12) should close first	57.0	68.1
The diocese should encourage new Catholic schools with lay faculty	70.0	43.2
The diocese should encourage the establishment of Catholic schools in the suburbs	87.7	60.7

The bishops were relatively consistent across all possible variables whereas the priests showed some significant differences based on location of assignment. As Table 26 indicates, priests stationed in rural areas and the inner city were the strongest in wishing to keep elementary schools functioning. The rural priests were also strong in their thinking that second-

ary grades should be closed, 82 percent. The priests were probably strongest in wishing to keep elementary grades because they are most closely connected with those grades through their parish schools. Many secondary schools are diocesan, regional or run by religious communities. Very often the priests have less contact with those schools than they do with schools in their own parishes. In regard to closing secondary schools first, the priests in the top ten states had a lower percentage (63%) than the priests in the other 40 (75%).

Bishops were much more interested in building new Catholic schools with lay faculties than were the priests, 70 percent as compared to 43 percent (Table 25). The bishops in the Mideast at 50 percent were the least interested while the bishops in the Southwest at 76 percent were the most interested. The same was true with the bishops in the top ten states; only 63 percent of those thought there should be new schools with lay faculties, while 79 percent of the bishops in the other 40 states thought so (Table C34, Appendix C). These percentages perhaps reflect a longer history of lay participation in church activities in smaller dioceses with lower numbers of priests and religious. They may also reflect the rapid population growth in the sunbelt and the southwest.

Among the priests, pastors were the least interested in encouraging new schools with lay faculties. Only 38 percent of them agreed with the statement compared to 51 percent of the associate pastors (Table C34, Appendix C). The differences here between priests and bishops could be a source of some tension. Pastors seem especially reluctant to establish schools with lay faculties, perhaps because they would be the ones to fund the schools. There is no question that any new Catholic schools would be predominately if not exclusively lay. There is little chance that schools will have large religious faculties.

TABLE 26—Alternative Structures for Schools by Assignment

	PRIESTS % AGREED			
	INNER CITY	URBAN	SUB-URBAN	RURAL
Close the elementary grades first	13.2	18.1	22.0	7.9
Close the secondary grades first	60.4	64.6	59.6	82.1

The bishops were very strong in their perceptions that the dioceses should encourage the establishment of Catholic schools in the suburbs where most Catholics live today. A large majority of 88 percent of the bishops agreed compared to 61 percent of the priests.

Age made a big difference here; the younger bishops, that is, those ordained under 20 years and priests ordained under 30 years were significantly different from their peers. Only 67 percent of the bishops ordained under 21 years agreed compared to 82 percent for those ordained 21 to 30 years, 91 percent for those ordained 31 to 40, and 96 percent for those ordained 41 or more years.

The priests followed the same basic pattern; those ordained 11 to 20 years only agreed with the statement at the rate of 49 percent while those 21 to 30 and 10 and under agreed 57. Those ordained 31 to 40 years agreed at 73 and 41 and over at 77 percent (Table C35, Appendix C).

Bishops who attended Catholic elementary school five years or more agreed that schools should be established in the suburbs at the rate of 91 percent as compared to bishops who had never attended Catholic school at 74. An equally large majority of bishops (89%) who had been in parishes with schools agreed, compared to 76 percent of those who had never been in a parish with a school. In regard to priests, 68 percent of those had taught in Catholic schools agreed compared to 56 percent of those who had never taught in Catholic schools (Table C36, Appendix C).

Thus, a large percentage of bishops thought that Catholic schools should be established in the suburbs, although a slightly smaller percentage thought they should be staffed by lay people. Bishops and priests were generally in agreement that if any grades had to be eliminated, the secondary grades should be eliminated first.

Regionalization and Centralization of Schools

The question of regionalization was addressed in two different ways. First, bishops and priests were asked their perceptions about the situation where there was only one Catholic school in the area. In this case, several parishes would be asked to support the school financially. Here the bishops and priests were virtually unanimous; 94 percent of the bishops and 93 percent of the priests agreed (Ta-

ble 27). There was no significant difference in the regional responses except for New England bishops whose agreement over 20 percentage points below the rest of the country, 71 percent compared to approximately 95 percent (Table C37, Appendix C). There is no ready explanation for this large difference.

The second question on regionalization asked if it was generally better to operate schools on a regional basis and perhaps have fewer Catholic schools and higher quality. The bishops and priests were not as ready to endorse this concept. Only 59 percent of the bishops and 73 percent of the priests thought that regional elementary and secondary schools were a good idea (Table 27).

TABLE 27—Regionalization and Centralization of Schools

	RESPONDENTS	
	BISHOPS AGREED %	PRIESTS AGREED %
Where there is one school and several parishes, the school should be regionalized	94.9	93.2
It would be better to operate schools on a regional basis	58.9	72.6
All Catholic schools should be administered as a part of a diocesan system	48.8	53.4

There were significantly different regional perceptions for both the priests and bishops. Only 25 percent of the bishops and 46 percent of the priests in the Plains states thought that regionalization is a good thing. Because there are fewer schools in the Plains states, perhaps regionalization is impractical. The New England bishops were consistent in their objection to regionalization; exactly half of them thought that it was a good idea compared to 88 percent of the New England priests. Although a majority of the bishops and substantial majority of the priests liked regionalization, it seems as if it is a particularly geographical question (Table C38, Appendix C).

There was a significant difference in perceptions among the priests on regionalization based on years ordained and years in a parish with a school. Those ordained 30 years and under are most in favor of regionalization, while those ordained 31 years

and over are less in favor. Of those priests who have never been in a parish with a school, 96 percent liked regionalization while 75 percent of those who had been in a parish with a school one to ten years agreed and 67 percent of those with 11 or more years. It is probable that the closer a person is to a particular institution the less likely that person is to wish it absorbed in a larger entity (Table C39, Appendix C).

Slightly less than one half of the bishops and slightly more than one half of the priests would have liked to see all Catholic schools administered as a part of a diocesan system rather than as individual parish schools (Table 27). The only significant differences occurred in regard to attendance at Catholic secondary schools. Those priests who attended over three years agreed with the statement at 49 percent while those who had never attended Catholic secondary school agreed at 67 percent. The bishops probably did not wish to take on the administrative burdens connected with the diocesan system and the priests did not wish to see control removed from the local area.

Staffing and Authority Issues

In general bishops and priests did not think that the increase in the number of lay teachers in Catholic schools has improved the quality of those schools. Only 24 percent of the bishops and 35 percent of the priests agreed (Table 28). Diocesan bishops agreed even less, at 18 percent while auxiliary bishops agreed at 35 percent. Those bishops who had taught in Catholic schools have a slightly higher

TABLE 28—Staffing and Authority Issues

	RESPONDENTS	
	BISHOPS AGREED %	PRIESTS AGREED %
Lay teachers in Catholic schools have improved the quality of schools	23.5	35.2
Catholic schools must give greater policy control to parents	63.4	40.1
The pastor's primary relationship to the school should be that of spiritual leader	92.1	90.6
The single most influential person in parish school management is the pastor	66.4	50.1

percentage, 36 percent, than those bishops who had never taught in a Catholic school 16 percent (Table C40, Appendix C).

A majority of the bishops, 63 percent, thought that Catholic schools must give greater policy control to parents. A significantly smaller percentage of priests agreed, 40 percent.

Those bishops who had never been in a parish with a school agreed at a very high rate, 88 percent while only 59 percent of those bishops who had been in a school for 11 or more years agree. The priests do not follow the same pattern, only 48 percent of those priests who have never been in a parish with a school think that parents should have greater policy control, while 29 percent of those in a parish with a school for from six to ten years and 38 percent of those in a school for 11 or more years agreed. There seemed to be some indication that the more experience a priest or bishop had with a parish with a school, the less likely he was to afford parents greater policy control (Table C41, Appendix C).

There was also a significant difference between those priests who attended Catholic secondary schools for three or more years and those who did not. In this case, 43 percent of the priests who did attend Catholic secondary schools and only 27 percent of the priests who did not would give greater policy control to the parents. Priests in the top ten states had a low agreement rate of 34 percent compared to 48 percent of the priests in the other states (Table C41, Appendix C).

Bishops and priests agreed almost unanimously that the pastor's primary role in relationship to the school should be that of a spiritual leader. There seemed to be no significant differences in these perceptions based on any other function or activity (Table 28).

Bishops and priests did differ on how they view the pastor's role in parish school management. A majority of the bishops, 66 percent, thought the pastor is the single most influential person in the structure of parish school management, while only 50 percent of the priests agreed.

The number of years a bishop spent in a parish with a school seemed to make a difference in his perception. The longer he was in the parish with a school, the more important he tended to think the pastor is. Those bishops who had never been

in a parish with a school agreed with the statement at a rate of only 56 percent while 76 percent of those who have been in a parish with a school 11 or more years agreed (Table C42, Appendix C).

Priests' perceptions of the pastor's management role varied according to years of ordination. Those ordained 11 to 20 years agreed that the pastor is the most influential person at a rate of 40 percent, those 21 to 30 at 47, those 31 to 40 at 54 and those 41 and over 77. Those 10 years and under agreed at 51 percent. As with the bishops age was a factor in the perceptions of priests on this issue (Table C43, Appendix C).

Other significant differences occurred in regard to whether or not a priest was a member of a religious community. Slightly over half of the priests who were not members of a religious community, 54 percent, agreed that the pastor is influential while only 36 percent of the religious community members agree. There was also a difference in regard to the top ten states. Those in the top ten agreed with the statement at a rate of 45 percent, while those in the other 40 agreed at 58.

Whether or not a priest has been a principal of a Catholic school also made a difference in the perception. Of those who were principals, 68 percent agreed about the pastor's influence in school management while only 49 percent of those who had not been principals agreed. In general, those further away from the parish and those with the least parish experience saw a more active role for the pastor in school management. Those on the scene were less sure.

Clearly bishops and priests would keep elementary schools over secondary if one group were forced to close. A large majority of bishops and a smaller majority of priests would encourage new Catholic schools in the suburbs, but a smaller percentage of each would want those schools staffed by lay faculties. A majority of both groups were in favor of regionalized schools, priests more than bishops. A small majority of bishops and only four in ten priests wanted to give greater authority to parents.

CHAPTER 8

Unity and Diversity

In looking at bishops' and priests' perceptions, it is instructive to examine those areas where they had the highest percentage of positive responses and the lowest. For the sake of discussion, a high percentage is defined as anything the bishops agreed to at a rate of over 90 percent and a low percentage is anything under 60 percent.

It would also be interesting to look at those areas in which the bishops and priests showed some unanimity, here defined as being within ten percent of each other. It is also important to look at those areas where they showed the greatest diversity, that is, 20 percent or more of a difference.

High Agreement Among Bishops and Priests

The highest percentage of agreement and a high level of unanimity came on the statement that the Catholic school forms a part of the church's saving mission, where 100 percent of the bishops and 95 percent of the priests agreed (Table 29). The bishops also agreed at 99 percent that the Catholic school affords the fullest and best opportunity to realize the three-fold purpose of Christian education; the priests only agreed at 76 percent, a significant diversity.

Bishops and priests agreed at 98 and 83 percent respectively that Catholic schools serve a critical need within the context of complete education. They agreed at 97 percent for bishops and 83 percent for priests that Catholic schools perform an essential service for the church. Over 97 percent of the bishops and 84 percent of the priests thought that Catholic schools have a positive impact on the adult religious behavior of their graduates. Almost 97 percent of the bishops and 80 percent of the priests agreed that there

TABLE 29—Bishops' High Agreement on General Value of Schools

	RESPONDENTS	
	BISHOPS AGREED %	PRIESTS AGREED %
Forms part of the church's saving mission	100.0	94.7
Affords fullest and best opportunity to realize the three-fold purpose	98.6	76.2
Catholic schools have a positive impact on adult religious behavior of graduates	97.2	84.4
Serves a critical human need within the context of a complete education	97.7	82.7
Performs an essential service for the church	96.8	83.4
The difference between Catholic and public schools is still great enough to justify two separate school systems	96.8	80.0
Quality of Catholic schools generally satisfactory	95.9	88.7
The need for Catholic schools is at least as great today as it was in the past	92.7	71.6
Strengthens the bonds of parish unity	92.5	78.4

was enough difference between Catholic and public schools to justify the two separate school systems. At the same time, 96 percent of the bishops and 89 percent of the priests thought that the quality of Catholic schools in their areas are generally satisfactory.

In regard to the need for Catholic schools today as compared to the past, 93 percent of the bishops agreed while only 72 percent of the priests agreed. According to 93 percent of the bishops, a plus for Catholic schools was that they strengthen the bonds of parish unity; 78 percent of the priests agreed with that statement.

In regard to financing Catholic schools, 96 percent of the bishops and 79 percent of the priests agreed that the support for the schools is the duty of all Catholics whether or not they have children in Catholic schools (Table 30). Where there is only one school and several parishes, finances should be shared among several parishes according to 95 percent of the bishops and 93 percent of the priests. This statement also showed a high degree of unanimity. A pastor's primary relationship to the school should be that of spiritual leader according to 92 percent of the bishops and 91 percent of the priests, again showing a high degree of unanimity.

TABLE 30—Bishops' High Agreement on Financing Schools and Related Issues

	RESPONDENTS	
	BISHOPS AGREED %	PRIESTS AGREED %
The financial support of Catholic schools is the duty of all Catholics whether or not they have children in Catholic schools	95.9	79.2
Where there is one school and several parishes, the school should be regionalized	94.9	93.2
The pastor's primary relationship to the school should be that of spiritual leader	91.2	90.6
Educate those who suffer from economic deprivation or discrimation based on race or linguistic difference	92.0	76.2
If some grades have to close, the elementary grades (1–8) should not be closed first	89.7	84.6
Catholic schools make effective use of the church's resources	91.7	66.2

According to 92 percent of the bishops and 76 percent of the priests, Catholic schools should educate those who suffer from economic deprivation or discrimination based on linguistic differences. In regard to which grade should be closed first, 90 pecent of the bishops and 86 percent of the priests agreed that the elementary grade should not be closed first. Finally, 92 percent of the bishops and 66 percent of the priests thought that Catholic schools make an effective use of the church's resources. Thus the highest percentages of agreement came in those areas dealing with the need for Catholic schools, the role of Catholic schools in the mission of the church, duties of the church to support those schools, the overall quality of schools and from the bishops point of view the schools' use of the church's resources.

Low Agreement

There was a generally low percentage of agrement (under 60 percent) in the area of finances (Table 31). Only 45 percent of the bishops and 46 percent of the priests thought there should be an annual education collection for Catholic schools. In regard to administering the Catholic schools as a part of a diocesan system, 49 percent

TABLE 31—Areas of Low Agreement Among Bishop Respondents

	RESPONDENTS	
	BISHOPS AGREED %	PRIESTS AGREED %
An annual diocesan education collection for Catholic schools should be established	45.1	45.5
All Catholic schools should be administered as part of a diocesan system	48.8	53.4
Tuition is the main reason parents do not choose Catholic schools for their children	59.0	58.3
If some grades have to close, the secondary grades (9–12) should close first	57.0	68.1
Parish contribution to the operational cost of the elementary school should not exceed 40 percent of per pupil cost	52.6	68.7
Lay teachers in Catholic schools have improved the quality of schools	23.5	35.2
It would be better to operate schools on a regional basis	58.9	72.6
Catholic schools use a disproportionate amount of parish revenue for the number of parishioners served	53.3	73.1
General subsidies to parishes with schools should be eliminated in favor of a diocesan scholarship fund	40.3	75.1

of the bishops and 53 percent of the priests agreed. They also agreed on the question that tuition was the main reason parents do not choose Catholic schools for their children, 59 percent for the bishops and 58 percent for the priests.

Only 57 percent of the bishops and 68 percent of the priests thought that if some grades had to close, the secondary grades should close first. There was some inconsistency in their thinking on this issue. Only 53 percent of the bishops and 69 percent of the priests were in favor of putting limits on the amount of subsidy parishes should give to Catholic schools. In regard to lay teachers providing contributed services to the schools and making some financial sacrifices, 58 percent of the bishops agreed and 42 percent of the priests. Slightly less than 59 percent of the bishops and 73 percent of the priests agreed that it would be better to operate schools on a regional basis.

Two questions had a low percentage of agreement, but a high degree of divergence (20 percent or more). Although the bishops were almost evenly split (53%) on the question of whether or not Catholic schools use a disproportionate amount of parish revenue for the number of parishioners served, 73 percent of the priests agreed that the schools do use too much of parish money. In another funding question, 40 percent of the bishops but 75 percent of the priests agreed that general subsidies to parishes for schools should be eliminated in favor of a diocesan scholarship fund.

Bishops and priests had similar perceptions on the question of Catholic elementary and secondary schools being better than governmental elementary and secondary schools; in both case the bishops agreed at approximately 89 percent and priests agreed at approximately 80 percent. As mentioned earlier, they also thought the same on the questions of pastors and their spiritual role in the school, the school's forming a part of the church's saving mission, an annual diocesan collection for schools, tuition as a reason for parents not sending their children to the schools and the quality of Catholic schools being generally satisfactory.

Divergence

On some questions, there was great divergence of perceptions (20 percent or more). Although 80 percent of the bishops agreed that Catholic secondary schools form articulate, convinced Catholics ready for today's society, only 51 percent of the priests agreed. While only 21 percent of the bishops agreed that generally Catholics who go to public schools turn out to be as good as Catholic who went to Catholic schools; 47 percent of the priests agreed. In regard to the diocese's encouraging new Catholic schools with lay faculties, 70 percent of the bishops but only 43 percent of the priests agreed. The same was true in regard to the diocese's encouraging the establishment of Catholic schools in the suburbs; 88 percent of the bishops and 61 percent of the priests agreed.

There was also great divergence on whether Catholic schools should give greater policy control to parents. The bishops agreed at the rate of 63 percent; but only 40 percent of the priests thought that parents should have increased control.

Two religious education questions showed a wide diversity between priests and bishops. Only 8 percent of the bishops but almost 29 percent of the priests thought that improved CCD programs should eventually replace Catholic schools. A similar split occurred when only 29 percent of the bishops and 50 percent of the priests

thought that the church should make a major investment in adult religious education, even if it means a cut back in the school programs.

Other areas of divergence already mentioned concern the establishment of a diocesan scholarship fund, the perception that the need for Catholic schools is as great today as it was in the past and that Catholic schools afford the fullest opportunity to realize the three-fold purpose of Catholic education.

The areas that showed the widest divergence in thinking between the bishops and the priests center around religious education outside of schools, the effectiveness of Catholic schools in forming students in Christian living, the need for Catholic schools today and their ability to fulfill the purpose for which they were established, the establishment of new schools, the giving of greater policy control to parents and whether or not schools are an effective use of parish resources. These questions are all vital to the church; a wide divergence between bishops and priests makes it difficult for administrators to carry out the work of Catholic education.

Other Variables

Years of ordination, which also reflects age, was an important indicator of how bishops and priests perceived various issues. Generally, priests between the ages of 39 and 48, that is, ordained 11 to 20 years, saw the least value in Catholic schools. The priests who saw the greatest value have been ordained over 31 years. An example of this difference was the question of whether Catholic schools afford the best opportunity to realize the three-fold purpose of Christian eduation. Only 71 percent of the priests ordained under 31 years agreed, while 87 percent of those ordained 31 years or more agreed. The same pattern emerged in regard to the question of the value of Catholic schools compared to public schools. It was also true in the case of how priests viewed the positive impact of Catholic schools on adult religious behavior. Once again, the priests ordained 11 or 20 years had a significantly lower perception of that effectiveness than do all other priests.

On the question of whether Catholic schools are the responsibility of the whole church, those ordained 11 to 20 years had the lowest rate of agreement. Since this age group is made up of young pastors or those who are about to become pastors, their perceptions of Catholic schools are extremely important.

Bishops showed a similar pattern when age and years of ordination are taken into account. Bishops aged 46 to 55, ordained 21

to 30 years, showed a significantly lower agreement than other bishops that Catholic elementary schools are generally better than governmental schools. In regard to the question of religious education, only 56 percent of the youngest bishops in the country, those ordained 11 to 20 years, agreed that Catholic schools are more effective than other catechetical programs; the agreement rate for the rest of the bishops was 88 percent.

The same was true for bishops' perceptions in regard to the schools' use of church revenue. Almost 78 percent of the bishops ordained under 20 years and 69 percent of those 21 to 30 years thought that Catholic schools use a disproportionate amount of parish revenue compared to the number of parishioners served. That compares to approximately 42 percent for the bishops ordained over 31 years. Also in regard to religious education, the bishops ordained 11 to 20 years and 21 to 30 years agreed at a rate of over 40 percent that dioceses should make a major investment in adult religious education even if it means a cut back in school programs. Bishops ordained 31 years and over agreed with the statement at a rate of approximately 21 percent.

Perhaps one of the most important indications for the future of Catholic schools is the perception of bishops ordained under 20 years in regard to building new schools in the suburbs. Only 67 percent of the bishops ordained under 21 years and 82 percent of those ordained 21 to 30 years agreed that new schools should be built compared to 91 percent for the remaining bishops.

Attendance at Catholic elementary and secondary schools also made a difference in the perceptions of bishops and priests. Priests who have attended five or more years of Catholic elementary school and three or more years of Catholic secondary school tended to be much more positive in regard to the whole question of Catholic schools.

The group of priests least favorable to Catholic schools were those who attended less than five years of Catholic elementary school and less than three years of Catholic secondary school; they are even less positive than those priests who have never attended Catholic schools. For example, only 60 percent of those who attended Catholic elementary schools for four years or less thought that their general quality is satisfactory compared to 90 percent of all other priests. It would be expected that those bishops and priests who went to Catholic schools would have closer bonds with those schools than those who did not.

CHAPTER 9

Conclusions and Future Directions

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OUTSIDE OF SCHOOLS

Greeley (1985) has some harsh things to say about religious education programs outside of schools. He wrote that "there are virtually no statistically significant correlations between attendance at C.C.D. and later religious beliefs or behaviors and there are strong and statistically significant correlations between attendance at Catholic schools and adult religious behaviors" (p. 134). Later in the same chapter, he claimed that in all the research that he has done on the effectiveness of education he has not:

> been able to find any persuasive evidence of ANY effect on adult religious behavior of participation in C.C.D. courses. For all the enthusiasm, for all the energy, for all the financial commitment, it simply has to be said that as of 1979, the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine as a substitute for Catholic schools is simply a waste of time (p. 137).

(Some would argue that more recent efforts in religious education outside of schools do make a difference, but there has been no study since Greeley's in 1979.)

Further, Greeley (1985) called the Catholic schools a casualty of the post-conciliar era. He claimed that the decision was made to replace Catholic schools with parish catechetical programs. Bishops, pastors and church educators have "deliberately ignored the evidence of the effectiveness of Catholic schools and the ineffective-

ness of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine and chosen to support C.C.D. as a substitute for and replacement of the parochial school" (p. 138). Greeley claimed that the decision was one that is very hard to justify.

Although they would probably not put it so strongly, the United States bishops seemed to agree with Greeley. In general they did not see catechetical programs, as they currently exist, having the effectiveness of Catholic schools. As Table 32 indicates, 87.2 percent of the bishops agreed that religious education programs will never be as effective as Catholic schools; almost three quarters of the bishops thought that secondary programs are not adequate. Clearly the bishops did not see schools closing and being replaced by religious education programs; nine out of ten agreed that other forms of religious education should not replace the schools.

Even when it came to adult education, less than 30 percent of the bishops thought that church should make a major investment in this area if it means a cutback in school programs. Since working with adults is such a critical part of the contemporary church's educational ministry, it is surprising that so few bishops would be willing to put adult education ahead of Catholic schools.

TABLE 32—Parish Religious Education Programs Outside of Schools

	RESPONDENTS	
	BISHOPS AGREED %	PRIESTS AGREED %
Religious education programs (CCD) will never be as effective as Catholic schools	87.2	68.3
Present catechetical programs for secondary school students cannot provide adequate formation	74.0	61.6
Improved religious education programs (CCD) should eventually replace Catholic schools	7.8	28.8
If there is no public aid within three years, the diocese should close the schools and concentrate on other forms of religious education	7.8	26.2
Make a major investment in adult religious education even if it means a cutback in school programs	29.2	49.6

The priests differed significantly from the bishops. Again as Table 31 indicates, they were less sure that Catholic schools should not be replaced. However, a majority of the priests agreed with the bishops, except in the case of adult education where the split was almost even.

Thus, bishops and priests have a perception that current religious education programs outside of schools are lacking in effectiveness and quality. At the same time, neither the bishops nor the priests have initiated serious studies into the question of religious education outside of schools, even though over half of the Catholic children and youth who receive any kind of religious education are in parish catechetical programs. Kelly, Benson, and Donahue (1986) have published a study on the the effectiveness of parish religious education programs. By the admission of its authors, it is a "very tentative, preliminary effort" (p. vi). Althought a great step forward, it is seriously limited by its "effective school" methodology.

NEW CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

Many people have noted that part of the decrease in enrollment in Catholic schools in the last 20 years has been due to geography. Catholics have become more affluent and moved out of the cities into the suburbs. A sufficient number of schools have not been built to accommodate the children in suburban parishes. As was noted earlier almost 88 percent of the bishops thought that the church should establish new Catholic schools in the suburbs; a lesser number of bishops (70%) thought that there should be new Catholic schools established with lay faculties. According to the National Catholic Educational Association's Data Bank, in the last 15 years less than 50 new schools have been built in the entire United States, although 2,098 have closed during that same period. If the bishops think that schools are so important and should be built, why have they not built them? Perhaps, part of the reason is the perceptions of the priests.

Only 61 percent of the priests thought that schools should be built in the suburbs and less than a majority (43%) thought that there should be new schools with lay faculties. Some say the problem is money; others say that is an excuse. The real reason lies in the unwillingness of the priests to take on the burden of establishing new Catholic schools. It is understandable that priests would not want to take on the whole burden of building new schools. At the

same time, they do not seem willing to share that burden with parents by giving over more control of the schools.

POSSIBLE ACTIONS

Based on the results of this study, it seems that the church in the United States could do some things that would help Catholic education in general.

First, a broad-based organization such as the NCEA could begin a national study on the regionalization and centralization of Catholic elementary schools that would assist dioceses in establishing regional schools that maintain effective contact with parishes. The same organization could design workshops for priests on how to deal effectively with Catholic schools. The NCEA could also begin a study to determine why those priests who do not value Catholic schools think the way they do.

Second, the bishops of the United States could gather together selected priests, religious and lay people to meet with the bishops to discuss the whole question of Catholic school finances in order to arrive at alternative financial plans for the schools. At the very least, the bishops could be given advice on how best to obtain government aid.

Third, people need to encourage the bishops to take the whole question of federal aid more seriously. The bishops are not politically effective (and therefore neither is the church) and probably never will be until they are willing to enter into politics in a professional way. If Catholic schools ever get federal aid it will be after a ten year commitment to a fulltime lobbying effort that will cost close to 20 million dollars, two million a year. Some groups have ten times as many lobbying *organizations* in Washington as the church has people in the USCC government liaison office.

Fourth, there is a great need for an in-depth study of religious education programs outside of schools to find alternative programs that are effective. Much of what is being done now in religious education may be effective, but the evidence points in another direction. If the bishops and priests want effective religious education programs, they need to put money into coordinated research. Without research, no one will ever know what programs work and the church will suffer. There is a very serious problem in this area, in some ways more serious than the school question. There is no indication that the church in the United States is taking it seriously.

Fifth, the bishops also need to promote consultative educational groups on the diocesan and parish levels in order to provide increased local governance for Catholic schools. Governance is a key issue that can only be solved by those people who have the authority and power to do so, namely, the bishops.

Sixth, perhaps through the United States Catholic Conference and the National Catholic Educational Association, the bishops should also provide curriculum materials for seminarians concerning the value and effectiveness of Catholic schools and encourage seminarians to use these materials.

Seventh, the bishops should also come up with ways to help priests' personnel boards in the United States to screen priests before appointing them pastors of parishes with schools in order that those priests who value schools will be appointed to parishes with schools.

Of the seven suggestions, six are directed toward the bishops. The reason is simple. The bishops have the authority, the responsibility, and the power. They are the only ones who can act effectively in these areas. They can seek help from others in the church, but they must make the first move.

SUMMARY

1. A high majority of bishops and priests saw Catholic schools as having a value sufficient to justify their continued existence.

2. Bishops and priests saw Catholic schools as playing an important and essential role in the church's mission. There was more agreement among bishops and priests when that perception was stated generally. There was less agreement when it moved into specifics, such as, evangelization, racial integration, education for justice and peace and strengthening the bonds of parish unity.

3. There was a significantly wide divergence among bishops and priests on how Catholic schools provide the fullest and best opportunity to realize the three-fold purpose of Christian education. Almost 100 percent of the bishops agreed while only 76 percent of the priests agreed.

4. A clear majority of priests and bishops saw Catholic schools as generally satisfactory.

5. Priests and bishops saw Catholic elementary and secondary schools as academically better than the local public schools.

6. Bishops and priests agreed by a large majority that Catholic

schools have a positive impact on adult religious behavior of their graduates; yet, that agreement was not as unanimous or strong in regard to whether people who go to Catholic schools turn out better adult Catholics than those who go to public schools.

7. More bishops than priests thought that Catholic schools make effective use of the church's resources, while a majority of both groups thought that the schools use too much of these resources given the number of people they serve.

8. A clear majority of the bishops and a majority of priests thought that each parish should continue to finance its own school, although both groups thought that some limits should be placed on how much money a parish contributes to a school.

9. A very large majority of the bishops and 79 percent of the priests thought that it is the duty of all Catholics to support Catholic schools. They were not as clear, however, on how they thought those schools should be supported. Neither group seemd to want an annual education collection. Priests would like a diocesan scholarship fund, but bishops would not.

10. A majority of the priests and bishops thought that tuition is the reason why many parents do not send their children to Catholic schools.

11. Bishops and priests did not see parish religious education programs outside of schools replacing Catholic schools. A majority of the bishops and 50 percent of the priests did not even see adult eduction programs becoming a priority if it means cutting back on Catholic schools.

12. Bishops and priests were clearly more attached to elementary schools than to secondary schools.

13. A large percentage of the bishops were in favor of establishing Catholic schools in the suburbs even if those schools have lay faculties. Yet, in fact bishops have not built new schools in any sizeable numbers in the last 15 years. Priests were less interested in building new schools, especially if they have lay faculties.

14. Bishops and priests were interested in regionalized schools if there was only one school in a given area. They were less interested in regional schools in general, although priests were more interested than bishops. Neither group was particularly interested in reorganizing Catholic schools into a diocesan system.

15. Priests and bishops did not think that lay teachers have improved the quality of Catholic schools, although it is not clear

whether they thought lay teachers have diminished the quality of the schools.

16. A small majority of the bishops were interested in giving greater policy control of the schools to parents, while less than 50 percent of the priests were.

17. Bishops and priests agreed by a very large percentage that the pastor's primary role in the school should be that of spiritual leader.

18. In general, there was a direct relationship between age and priests' valuing of Catholic schools. When first ordained, a large percentage of priests seemed to value the schools until approximately age 39. The percentage lessened significantly and then increased beginning at age 48. The older the priest, the more he seemed to valued the schools.

19. In general, pastors valued schools less than associates.

APPENDIX A

Research Methodology

Sullivan (1981) developed the survey instrument in 1978 for use with the priests of the archdiocese of Boston. That development included reliability validity studies. Schipper (1982) used the questionnaire in a study of the priests of the archdiocese of San Francisco. Part I of the instrument, the section on background information, was changed to reflect differences between bishops and priests.

The Instrument Itself

There were two instruments in this study, one for bishops and one for priests. Part I of each contained 11 items designed to give the necessary background data for the respondent. This part of the questionnaire differed for each group.

Part II contained 42 items that concern the (1) value, (2) effectiveness, (3) financial viability, and (4) future structure of Catholic schools. Respondents are asked to give current perceptions for each item according to a four-point scale: strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree. Part II of the questionnaire was the same for both groups. (See Appendix B for copies of the questionnaires.)

For the purposes of the national study, the questionnaire was modified to eliminate all references to the "Archdiocese of Boston." As noted above, the first part of the questionnaire was modified to allow for the differences between bishops and priests. Also, the five point scale was reduced to four by the elimination of the "undecided" category.

Subjects

There were 273 active Roman Catholic bishops in the United States when the questionnaire was mailed. A letter with a questionnaire

was sent to the entire population of bishops. Included was a letter from the Archbishop of Saint Paul and Minneapolis, John R. Roach. Archbishop Roach was also the president of the board of directors of the National Catholic Educational Association. Thanks in part to Archbishop Roach's letter, the response rate from the bishops was 80.2 percent, 219 returns out of 273 sent.

There were 18,135 pastors and 19,437 future pastors for a total of 37,572 priests in parish work (*The Official Catholic Directory*, 1985). A letter with a questionnaire was sent to a random sample of 660 priests. The mailing list was generated randomly by the publishers of *The Official Catholic Directory* and contained a label for every fifty-seventh parish priest, beginning with a randomly selected first number. The sample size of 660 was an adequate number for the purpose of this study (Hinkle and Oliver, 1983).

A postage paid envelope was included in each letter. Two follow-up letters were sent after the initial questionnaire to those who have not responded. The response rate for priests was 52.4 percent, 346 returns out of 660 sent. The responses were validated by contacting 45 randomly selected priests from those who did not respond to the questionnaire.

Treatment of Data

The SPSSx was used to determine the basic characteristics of the data. The Spearman rho correlation coefficient was run to determine if there were any significant correlations among items. That information was used to run crosstabs on specific items. A chi-square treatment tested the statistical significance between the expected and observed frequencies. The study accepted levels of significance of .05. However, in order to show all relationships, levels of .1 and below were reported. For purposes of analysis and discussion, the data were collapsed into two categories (from four): agreed and disagreed.

APPENDIX B

Questionnaires and Letters

N C E A
NATIONAL CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION
SUITE 100
1077 30TH STREET NW
WASHINGTON DC
20007-3852
(202)
243-5954

February 19, 1986

Your Excellency:

I need your help -- less than 20 minutes of your time!

I am currently engaged in a national study of the perceptions of bishops and priests toward Catholic schools. You have been selected as a part of the population of bishops throughout the United States to participate in this study. I know I can count on your generous assistance.

Please complete the enclosed survey and return it to me in the enclosed self-addressed envelope before Friday, March 7, 1986.

Let me assure you that this survey is anonymous. All responses are completely confidential. None of the data will be presented in such a way that any individual can be identified.

Thank you for your help. May the Lord bless you during this Lenten season.

Sincerely,

Stephen O'Brien

Reverend J. Stephen O'Brien
Executive Director
Department of Chief Administrators

Encl:

A STUDY OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF BISHOPS TOWARD CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

PART I

Directions: Numbers 1-11 are items of background information. Please be as accurate as possible. For each question please **insert** the correct number or **circle** the number which corresponds to your answer.

1. What is your age? _____

2. How long have you been ordained a priest? _____

3. How long have you been ordained a bishop? _____

4. What is your present role?
   1. diocesan bishop
   2. auxiliary bishop
   3. retired bishop

5. Did you attend a Catholic elementary school?
   1. did not attend
   2. 1-2 years
   3. 3-4 years
   4. 5-8 years

6. Did you attend a Catholic high school?
   1. did not attend
   2. 1-2 years
   3. 3-4 years

7. Did you attend a Catholic college or university before entering the seminary?
   1. did not attend
   2. 1-2 years
   3. 3-4 years
   4. more than 4 years

8. What portion of your ministry has been in a parish with a school?
   1. none
   2. 1-5 years
   3. 6-10 years
   4. 11 years or more

9. Have you ever taught full time in a Catholic school?
   1. yes
   2. no

10. Were you ever a principal of a Catholic school?
    1. yes
    2. no

11. Were you ever a superintendent of Catholic schools?
    1. yes
    2. no

(Please continue to Part II)

PART II

Directions: Items 12-53 represent points of view about Catholic Schools. Using the following scale, indicate your reaction to these statements by circling the appropriate abbreviation following each item.

SA = STRONGLY AGREE
A = AGREE
D = DISAGREE
SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE

12.	The policy of each parish's financing its own school is still the best.	12.	SA	A	D SD
13.	The quality of Catholic schools in my area is satisfactory or above.	13.	SA	A	D SD
14.	It is impossible for the church to provide adequate religious and moral formation for public high school students with the present catechetical (CCD) programs.	14.	SA	A	D SD
15.	If parents of children in Catholic schools do not receive public aid within the next three years, the diocese should gradually close all schools and have each parish concentrate on other forms of religious education.	15.	SA	A	D SD
16.	Where Catholic schools are available, tuitions are the main reason why parents do not select them for their children.	16.	SA	A	D SD
17.	Improved CCD programs should eventually replace the conventional Catholic school approach.	17.	SA	A	D SD
18.	General subsidies to parishes with schools that cannot finance them should be eliminated in favor of an (archdiocesan scholarship program for all students based solely on demonstrated need.	18.	SA	A	D SD
19.	It would be better to operate on a regional basis (for example: regional elementary schools and regional high schools) fewer Catholic schools which would provide better quality programs, rather than continue to try to operate individual parish schools.	19.	SA	A	D SD
20.	The increase in the number of lay teachers required to staff Catholic schools has improved the quality of the educational programs in Catholic schools of the (archdiocese.	20.	SA	A	D SD
21.	The financial support of Catholic schools is the duty of all Catholics whether or not they have children in Catholic schools.	21.	SA	A	D SD
22.	Catholic schools use a disproportionate amount of parish revenue for the number of parishioners served.	22.	SA	A	D SD
23.	Since parents are responsible for the religious education of their children, the (archdiocese should make a major investment in adult religious education programs even if this means a cutback in school programs for children.	23.	SA	A	D SD
24.	Lay teachers in Catholic schools should sacrifice financial gain in order to provide some contributed services. In other words, lay teachers should be willing to accept a lower salary than they would receive in another school system.	24.	SA	A	D SD
25.	In terms of academic quality, Catholic elementary schools are better than public elementary schools in my area.	25.	SA	A	D SD
26.	In terms of academic quality, Catholic secondary schools are better than public secondary schools in my area.	26.	SA	A	D SD
27.	Catholic schools in the (archdiocese should play a greater role in educating those who have suffered economic deprivation or experienced discrimination because of racial, cultural, or linguistic differences.	27.	SA	A	D SD
28.	An annual diocesan education collection from each parish would be a good way of raising additional funds for increased support of Catholic schools.	28.	SA	A	D SD
29.	The differences between Catholic and public schools are no longer great enough to justify two separate school systems.	29.	SA	A	D SD
30.	Should Catholic schools have to close some grades, the elementary grades (1-8) should be closed first.	30.	SA	A	D SD

41.	Should Catholic schools have to close some grades, the high school (9-12) should be closed first.	41.	SA	A	D	SD
42.	All Catholic schools should be administered as part of a diocesan system rather than as individual parish schools.	42.	SA	A	D	SD
43.	Generally Catholics who go to public schools turn out to be just as good Catholics as those who attended Catholic schools.	43.	SA	A	D	SD
44.	Integration of Catholic schools in the (archdiocese must be a major priority for the leaders in Catholic schools.	44.	SA	A	D	SD
45.	The parish's contribution to the annual operational cost of the Catholic elementary school's education of a child should not extend beyond 40 percent of the annual per pupil cost (for example if the annual per pupil cost in your parish is $800.00, the parish should contribute no more than $320.00 per pupil from the general parish income to defray the total cost).	45.	SA	A	D	SD
46.	CCD programs will never be as effective in training young Catholics as Catholic schools have been.	46.	SA	A	D	SD
47.	Increased attention must be given to curricula in Catholic schools which emphasize education for justice and authentic human liberation.	47.	SA	A	D	SD
48.	In an area where there is only one Catholic school and several parishes, the Catholic school should be regionalized and all parishes should bear some responsibility for its financial support.	48.	SA	A	D	SD
49.	The Catholic school forms part of the saving mission of the church, especially for formation and education in the faith.	49.	SA	A	D	SD
40.	Catholic schools make effective use of the church's financial resources.	40.	SA	A	D	SD
41.	Catholic high schools form convinced, articulate Christians ready to take their places in contemporary society.	41.	SA	A	D	SD
42.	The pastor's primary role in relationship to the school should be that of spiritual leader.	42.	SA	A	D	SD
43.	Where they exist Catholic schools strengthen the bonds of unity within a parish community.	43.	SA	A	D	SD
44.	The (archdiocese should encourage new Catholic schools with lay faculties.	44.	SA	A	D	SD
45.	The Catholic school is one of the best means of evangelization in the church today.	45.	SA	A	D	SD
46.	Catholic schools serve a critical human need within the context of a complete education.	46.	SA	A	D	SD
47.	The need for Catholic schools is at least as great today as it was in the past.	47.	SA	A	D	SD
48.	The (archdiocese should encourage the establishment of Catholic schools in the suburbs.	48.	SA	A	D	SD
49.	Catholic schools have a positive impact on the adult religious behavior of their graduates.	49.	SA	A	D	SD
50.	The Catholic school in the world today performs an essential service for the church.	50.	SA	A	D	SD
51.	Catholic schools must give greater policy control to parents.	51.	SA	A	D	SD
52.	Catholic schools afford the fullest and best opportunity to realize the three-fold purpose of Christian education (doctrine, community, service) among children and young people.	52.	SA	A	D	SD
53.	The single most influential person in the structure of parish school management in my (archdiocese is the pastor.	53.	SA	A	D	SD

Comments _____

Please return this form to:

Rev. J. Stephen O'Brien
Suite 100 • 1077 30th Street N.W. • Washington, D.C. 20007-3852

N C E A
NATIONAL CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION

SUITE 100
1077 30TH STREET NW
WASHINGTON DC
20007-3852

(202)
293-5954

February 19, 1986

Dear Father:

I need your help -- less than 20 minutes of your time!

I am currently engaged in a national study of the perceptions of bishops and priests toward Catholic schools. You have been selected as a part of a sample of priests throughout the United States to participate in this study. I know I can count on your generous assistance.

Please complete the enclosed survey and return it to me in the enclosed self-addressed envelope before Friday, March 7, 1986.

Let me assure you that this survey is anonymous. All responses are completely confidental. None of the data will be presented in such a way that any individual can be identified.

Thank you for your help. May the Lord bless you during this Lenten season.

Sincerely,

Stephen O'Brien

Reverend J. Stephen O'Brien
Executive Director
Department of Chief Administrators

Encl:

A STUDY OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF PARISH PRIESTS TOWARD CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

PART I

DIRECTIONS: Numbers 1-11 are items of background information. Please be as accurate as possible. For each question please **insert** the correct number or **circle** the number which corresponds to your answer.

1. What is your age?

   _____

2. How long have you been ordained a priest?

   _____

3. What is your present role?
   1. pastor
   2. non-pastor, but primarily involved in parish work
   3. parish team ministry
   4. primarily involved in non-parish ministry

4. Did you attend a Catholic elementary school?
   1. did not attend
   2. 1-2 years
   3. 3-4 years
   4. 5-8 years

5. Did you attend a Catholic high school?
   1. did not attend
   2. 1-2 years
   3. 3-4 years

6. Did you attend a Catholic college or university before entering the seminary?
   1. did not attend
   2. 1-2 years
   3. 3-4 years
   4. 4 years or more

7. In which area would you classify your present assignment?
   1. **inner city**:
      an area within a major city generally located within the central portion and having a large concentration of low income inhabitants.
   2. **urban but not inner city**:
      a parish located within the limits of a major city, but not within an area designated as the inner city.
   3. **suburban**:
      located outside of the limits of a major city.
   4. **small town or rural**:
      located in an area that is not considered a suburb.

8. What portion of your ministry has been in a parish with a school?
   1. none
   2. 1-5 years
   3. 6-10 years
   4. over ten years

9. Are you a member of a religious community?
   1. yes
   2. no

10. Have you ever taught full time in a Catholic school?
    1. yes
    2. no

11. Have you ever been a Catholic school principal?
    1. yes
    2. no

(Please continue to Part II)

PART II was identical to the bishops' questionnaire.

APPENDIX C

Tables

TABLE C1—Ages of Respondents

AGE	RESPONDENTS			
	BISHOPS		PRIESTS	
	N	%	N	%
35 and under	0	0.0	45	13.0
36-45	5	2.3	91	26.3
46-55	72	32.9	77	22.3
56-65	89	40.6	93	26.9
66 and over	53	24.2	40	11.6
TOTAL	219	100.0	346	100.0

$\chi^2 = 10.65, p < .05$

TABLE C2—States by NCEA Regions

REGIONS	STATES
New England	Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont
Mideast	Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania
Great Lakes	Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin
Plains	Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota
Southeast	Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia
West	Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wyoming

TABLE C3—Ages of Priests by Region

REGIONS	AGES										% OF SAMPLE
	UNDER 35		36–45		46–55		56–65		66 AND OVER		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
New England	4	11.1	15	41.7	3	8.3	12	33.3	2	5.6	10.4
Mideast	14	15.7	23	25.8	16	18.0	22	24.7	14	15.7	25.7
Great Lakes	11	13.6	22	27.2	26	32.1	18	22.2	4	4.9	23.4
Plains	5	11.9	5	11.9	10	23.8	13	31.0	9	21.4	12.1
Southeast	4	10.0	12	30.0	10	25.0	7	17.5	7	17.5	11.6
West	7	12.1	14	24.1	12	20.7	21	36.2	4	6.9	16.8
TOTAL	45	13.0	91	26.3	77	22.3	93	26.9	40	11.6	100.0

$\chi^2 = 31.70, p < .05$

TABLE C4—Bishops Years Ordained Priest by Region

REGIONS	YEARS								% OF SAMPLE
	11–20		21–30		31–40		41 AND OVER		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
New England	0	0.0	2	14.3	11	78.6	1	7.1	6.4
Mideast	1	2.2	9	20.0	24	53.3	11	24.4	20.5
Great Lakes	4	8.5	19	40.4	16	34.0	8	17.0	21.5
Plains	2	6.9	9	31.0	10	34.5	8	27.6	13.2
Southeast	0	0.0	12	38.7	11	35.5	8	25.8	14.2
West	2	3.8	27	50.9	14	26.4	10	18.9	24.2
TOTAL	9	4.1	78	35.6	86	39.3	46	21.0	100.0

$\chi^2 = 27.50, p < .05$

TABLE C5—Priests Years Ordained Priest by Region

REGIONS	YEARS: 10 AND UNDER N	%	11–20 N	%	21–30 N	%	31–40 N	%	41 AND OVER N	%	% OF SAMPLE
New England	6	16.7	15	41.7	3	8.3	11	30.6	1	2.8	10.4
Mideast	19	21.3	21	23.6	17	19.1	19	21.3	13	14.6	25.7
Great Lakes	18	22.2	21	25.9	23	28.4	17	21.0	2	2.5	23.4
Plains	6	14.3	6	14.3	9	21.4	12	28.6	9	21.4	12.1
Southeast	6	15.0	11	27.5	12	30.0	7	17.5	4	10.0	11.6
West	14	24.1	11	19.0	13	22.4	16	27.6	4	6.9	16.8
TOTAL	69	19.9	85	24.6	77	22.3	82	23.7	33	9.5	100.0

$\chi^2 = 32.87, p < .05$

TABLE C6—Location of Current Priest Assignment

LOCATION	Respondents: TOP TEN N	%	OTHERS N	%	% OF SAMPLE
Inner City	34	17.8	21	14.0	16.1
Urban	44	23.0	41	27.3	24.9
Suburban	65	34.0	28	18.7	27.3
Rural	48	25.1	60	40.0	31.7
TOTAL	191	100.0	150	100.0	100.0

TABLE C7—Attendance at Catholic Elementary School

YEARS	Respondents: BISHOPS N	%	PRIESTS N	%
No Attendance	37	16.9	52	15.0
1–3	4	1.8	12	3.5
3–4	11	5.0	12	3.5
5–8	167	76.3	270	78.0
TOTAL	219	100.0	346	100.0

$\chi^2 = 2.42, p < .05$

TABLE C8—Attendance at Catholic Secondary School

YEARS	Respondents			
	BISHOPS		PRIESTS	
	N	%	N	%
None	34	15.7	71	20.6
1–2	6	2.8	14	4.1
3–4	177	81.6	260	75.4
TOTAL	217	100.0	345	100.0

$\chi^2 = 3.01, p < .05$

TABLE C9—Attendance at Catholic College

YEARS	Respondents			
	BISHOPS		PRIESTS	
	N	%	N	%
None	129	59.4	203	58.8
1–2	29	13.4	38	11.0
3–4	37	17.1	30	8.7
5 or more	22	10.1	74	21.4
TOTAL	217	100.0	345	100.0

$\chi^2 = 18.40, p < .05$

TABLE C10—Priests' Attendance at Catholic Elementary School by Region

REGIONS	Years								% OF SAMPLE
	NONE		1–2		3–4		5–8		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
New England	6	16.7	1	2.8	5	13.9	24	67.7	10.4
Mideast	17	19.1	3	3.4	1	1.1	68	76.4	25.7
Great Lakes	5	6.2	4	4.9	1	1.2	71	87.7	23.4
Plains	5	11.9	1	2.4	2	4.8	34	81.0	12.1
Southeast	7	17.5	0	0.0	2	5.0	31	77.5	11.6
West	12	20.7	3	5.2	1	1.7	42	72.4	16.8
TOTAL	52	15.0	12	3.5	12	3.5	270	78.0	100.0

$\chi^2 = 26.22, p < .05$

TABLE C11—Priests' Attendance at Catholic Secondary School by Region

	Years						
	NONE		1–2		3–4		% OF
REGIONS	N	%	N	%	N	%	SAMPLE
New England	14	38.9	2	5.6	20	55.6	10.4
Mideast	16	18.2	3	3.4	69	78.4	22.5
Great Lakes	10	12.3	2	2.5	69	85.2	23.5
Plains	6	14.3	2	4.8	34	81.0	12.2
Southeast	7	17.5	0	0.0	33	82.5	11.6
West	18	31.0	5	8.6	35	60.3	16.8
TOTAL	71	20.6	14	4.1	260	75.4	100.0

$\chi^2 = 23.50, p < .05$.

TABLE C12—Priests' Years in Parish with School by Region

	Years								
	NONE		1–5		6–10		11 OR MORE		% OF
REGIONS	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	SAMPLE
New England	6	16.7	11	30.6	9	25.0	10	27.8	10.4
Mideast	3	3.4	19	21.3	23	25.8	44	49.4	25.8
Great Lakes	5	6.3	13	16.3	18	22.5	44	55.0	23.2
Plains	1	2.4	9	21.4	6	14.3	26	61.9	12.2
Southeast	2	5.0	14	35.0	9	22.5	15	37.5	11.6
West	8	13.8	13	22.4	11	19.0	26	44.8	16.8
TOTAL	25	7.2	79	22.9	76	22.0	165	47.8	100.0

$\chi^2 = 25.42, p < .05$.

TABLE C13—Priests' Perceptions of Schools, Parish Unity and Essential Service by Region

	ITEMS							
	PARISH UNITY				ESSENTIAL SERVICE			
	AGREE		DISAGREE		AGREE		DISAGREE	
REGIONS	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
New England	23	65.7	12	34.4	28	80.0	7	20.0
Mideast	79	90.8	8	9.2	82	93.2	6	6.8
Great Lakes	63	79.7	16	20.3	66	83.5	13	16.5
Plains	33	78.6	9	21.4	36	87.5	6	14.3
Southeast	26	74.3	9	25.7	27	75.0	9	25.0
West	38	67.9	18	32.1	43	74.1	15	25.9
TOTAL	262	78.4	72	21.6	282	83.4	56	16.6

$\chi^2 = 15.36, p < .05$

TABLE C14—Priests' Perceptions by Assignment that Catholic Schools Should Educate the Economically and Culturally Deprived

	AGREED		DISAGREED	
ASSIGNMENT	N	%	N	%
Inner City	50	90.9	5	9.1
Urban	70	83.3	14	16.7
Suburban	65	72.2	25	27.8
Rural	68	68.0	32	32.0
TOTAL	253	76.9	76	23.1

$\chi^2 = 13.60, p < .05$

TABLE C15—Priests' Perceptions that Catholic Schools Should Make Integration a Priority by Years in a Parish with a School

	AGREED		DISAGREED	
YEARS	N	%	N	%
None	20	87.0	3	13.0
1–5	58	81.7	13	18.3
6–10	41	60.5	27	39.7
11 and over	103	67.3	50	32.7
TOTAL	222	70.5	93	29.5

$\chi^2 = 11.41, p < .05$

TABLE C16—Priests' Perceptions that Catholic Schools Should Emphasize Education for Justice and Human Liberation

YEARS	AGREED N	AGREED %	DISAGREED N	DISAGREED %
10 and under	49	73.1	18	26.9
11–20	69	85.2	12	14.8
21–30	52	72.2	20	27.8
31–40	53	67.1	26	32.9
41 and over	26	86.7	4	13.3
TOTAL	249	75.7	80	24.3

$\chi^2 = 9.82, p < .05$

TAUGHT IN CATHOLIC SCHOOL				
Yes	89	70.1	38	29.9
No	159	79.5	41	20.5
	248	75.8	79	24.2

$\chi^2 = 3.27, p < .1$

TABLE C17—Bishops' Perceptions that the Academic Quality of Catholic Elementary Schools are Better than Public Schools

YEARS ORDAINED PRIEST	AGREED N	AGREED %	DISAGREED N	DISAGREED %
11–20	9	100.0	0	0.0
21–30	63	81.8	14	18.2
31–40	75	89.3	9	10.7
41 and over	43	97.7	1	2.3
TOTAL	190	80.7	24	19.3

$\chi^2 = 8.44, p < .05$

TABLE C18—Bishop's and Priests' Perceptions that the Academic Quality of Catholic Secondary Schools are Better than Public Schools

YEARS ORDAINED PRIEST	BISHOPS AGREED %	PRIESTS AGREED %
10 and under	–	74.6
11–20	100.0	70.1
21–30	85.3	80.3
31–40	85.5	93.4
41 and over	100.0	90.3
TOTAL	89.2	80.7

For bishops, $X^2 = 8.82$, $p < .05$.
For priests, $X^2 = 16.89$, $p < .05$.

TABLE C19—Present Catechetical Programs for High School Cannot Provide Adequate Formation by Having Taught in Catholic School

TAUGHT FULLTIME IN CATHOLIC SCHOOL	BISHOPS AGREED %	PRIESTS AGREED %
Yes	64.6	68.7
No	79.3	57.2

For bishops, $X^2 = 4.84$, $p < .05$.
For priests, $X^2 = 4.02$, $p < .05$.

TABLE C20—Each Parish Should Continue to Finance Its Own School

YEARS ORDAINED PRIESTS	BISHOPS				PRIESTS			
	AGREED		DISAGREED		AGREED		DISAGREED	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
10 and under	–	–	–	–	37	53.6	32	46.4
11–20	2	22.2	7	77.8	37	44.6	46	55.4
21–30	56	72.7	21	27.3	37	49.3	38	50.7
31–40	70	84.3	13	15.7	54	66.7	27	33.3
41 and over	30	68.2	14	31.8	27	84.4	5	15.6
TOTAL	158	74.2	55	22.8	192	56.5	148	43.5

For bishops, $X^2 = 18.07$, $p < .05$.
For priests, $X^2 = 20.12$, $p < .05$.

YEARS IN PARISH WITH SCHOOL				
None	6	37.5	10	62.5
1–5	46	74.2	16	25.8
6–10	36	69.2	16	30.8
11 or more	70	84.3	13	15.7
	158	74.2	55	25.8

$\chi^2 = 16.37$, $p < .05$.

REGIONS				
New England	13	36.1	23	63.9
Mideast	56	53.5	40	46.5
Great Lakes	42	52.5	38	47.5
Plains	31	73.8	11	26.2
Southeast	25	64.1	14	35.9
West	35	61.4	22	38.6
	192	56.5	148	43.5

$\chi^2 = 13.52$, $p < .05$.

TABLE C21—Parish's Contribution to the Cost of Elementary School Should not Exceed 40 percent of the Per Pupil Cost

	RESPONDENTS							
	BISHOPS				PRIESTS			
	AGREED		DISAGREED		AGREED		DISAGREED	
REGIONS	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
New England	7	70.0	3	30.0	26	78.8	7	21.2
Mideast	16	42.1	22	57.9	61	77.2	18	22.8
Great Lakes	17	37.8	28	62.2	49	63.6	28	36.4
Plains	9	31.0	20	69.0	14	38.9	22	61.1
Southeast	18	66.7	9	33.3	23	67.6	11	32.4
West	36	76.6	11	23.4	38	79.2	10	20.8
TOTAL	103	52.6	93	47.4	211	68.7	96	31.3

For bishops, $X^2 = 25.26$, $p < .05$.
For priests, $X^2 = 22.50$, $p < .05$.

TABLE C22—Parish's Contribution to Cost of the Elementary School Should not Exceed 40 Percent of the Per Pupil Cost

	RESPONDENTS
ACTIVITY	BISHOPS AGREED %
11–20 years ordained	55.6
21–30 years ordained	67.6
31–40 years ordained	50.7
41 and over years ordained	29.3
Never attended Catholic elementary school	65.7
Attended 5–8 years	46.9
Never in parish with school	71.4
1–5 years in parish with school	44.2
6–10 years in parish with school	72.0
11 or more years in parish with school	42.5
	PRIESTS AGREED %
Top ten states	74.3
Other 40 states	60.9

Chi-square is significant at a level below .05.

TABLE C23—Catholic Schools Make Effective Use of the Church's Financial Resources

	RESPONDENTS
YEARS ORDAINED PRIEST	BISHOPS AGREED %
11–20	88.9
21–30	83.3
31–40	95.3
41 and over	100.0
LOCATION OF MINISTRY	**PRIESTS AGREED %**
Inner City	59.6
Urban	78.3
Suburban	61.1
Rural	63.4

Chi-square is significant at a level below .05

TABLE C24—Financial Support of Catholic Schools is the Duty of All Catholics

	BISHOPS				PRIESTS			
	AGREED		DISAGREED		AGREED		DISAGREED	
REGION	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
New England	2	14.3	12	85.7	25	71.4	10	28.6
Mideast	43	95.6	2	4.4	77	87.5	11	12.5
Great Lakes	47	100.0	0	0.0	63	77.8	18	22.2
Plains	29	100.0	0	0.0	38	90.5	4	9.5
Southeast	31	100.0	0	0.0	24	63.2	14	36.9
West	48	90.6	5	9.4	44	75.9	14	24.1
TOTAL	210	95.9	9	4.1	271	79.2	71	20.8

For bishops, $X^2 = 12.09$, $p < .05$
For Priests, $X^2 = 14.65$, $p < .05$

TABLE C25—Priests' Perceptions that the Financial Support of Catholic Schools is the Duty of All Catholics

ACTIVITY	RESPONDENTS: PRIESTS AGREED %
10 and under	97.7
11–20	71.8
21–30	74.7
31–40	85.2
41 and over	93.8
ROLE	
Pastor	74.9
Associate	84.0
Team	100.0
Non parish ministry	88.1
ATTENDED CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL	
None	71.0
1–2 years	57.1
3–4 years	83.9

Chi-square for the above is significant at a level below .05

TABLE C26—General Subsidies to Parishes with Schools that Cannot Finance them Should be Eliminated in Favor of a Diocesan Scholarship Fund

	BISHOPS				PRIESTS			
	AGREED		DISAGREED		AGREED		DISAGREED	
REGION	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
New England	5	38.5	8	61.6	15	45.5	18	54.5
Mideast	17	40.5	25	59.5	32	39.5	49	60.5
Great Lakes	14	30.4	32	69.6	44	57.9	32	42.1
Plains	4	14.8	23	85.2	11	28.9	27	71.1
Southeast	15	50.0	15	50.0	14	37.8	23	62.2
West	28	58.3	20	41.7	28	51.9	26	48.1
TOTAL	83	40.3	123	59.7	144	45.1	175	54.9

For bishops, $X^2 = 10.85$, $p < .05$
For Priests, $X^2 = 11.85$, $p < .05$

TABLE C27—Priests' Perceptions that an Annual Education Collection for Catholic Schools Should be Established

ROLE	PRIESTS AGREED %
Pastor	39.3
Associate	49.9
Team	90.0
Non parish ministry	52.4
ATTENDED CATHOLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	
None	34.6
1–4 years	69.6
5–8 years	45.6
YEARS IN PARISH WITH SCHOOL	
None	41.7
1–5	66.7
6–10	32.9
11 or more	41.9
REGION	
New England	70.6
Mideast	49.4
Great Lakes	38.0
Plains	46.3
Southeast	35.9
West	41.4

Chi square for the above is significant at a level below .05.

TABLE C28—Priests' Perceptions that Lay Teachers Should Sacrifice Financial Gain in order to Provide some "Contributed Services"

	PRIESTS AGREED %
10 and under	30.4
11–20	36.6
21–30	46.1
31–40	50.6
41 and over	59.4
ROLE	
Pastor	50.2
Associate	32.4
Team	20.0
Non parish ministry	29.3
YEARS IN PARISH WITH SCHOOL	
None	20.8
1–5	31.6
6–10	47.9
11 or more	49.7
MEMBER OF RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY	
Yes	26.6
No	46.5

Chi-square for the above is significant at a level below .05

TABLE C29—Priests' Perceptions that Tuition is the Main Reason Parents do not Select Catholic Schools for their Children

	PRIESTS			
	AGREED		DISAGREED	
ASSIGNMENT	N	%	N	%
Inner City	39	70.9	16	29.1
Urban	53	63.1	31	36.9
Suburban	53	58.2	38	41.8
Rural	49	47.6	54	52.4
TOTAL	194	58.3	139	41.7

$\chi^2 = 9.26, p < .05$

TABLE C30—Improved CCD Programs Should Eventually Replace the Conventional Catholic School Approach

ROLE	AGREED N	AGREED %	DISAGREED N	DISAGREED %
Diocesan Bishop	8	5.4	141	94.6
Auxiliary Bishop	9	11.9	59	88.1
TOTAL	17	7.8	200	92.0

$\chi^2 = 14.58, p < .05$

Bishop attended Catholic college 4 plus years	5	22.7	17	77.3
Bishop never attended Catholic college	9	7.0	119	93.0
TOTAL	14	7.8	136	92.2

$\chi^2 = 7.84, p < .05$

Pastor	70	32.9	143	67.1
All other priests	27	21.7	97	78.3
TOTAL	97	28.8	240	71.2

$\chi^2 = 7.93, p < .05$

TABLE C31—If There Is No Public Aid for Catholic School Parents Within Three Years, the Diocese Should Gradually Close All Schools and Concentrate on Other Forms of Religious Education

ACTIVITY	AGREED %
Diocesan bishop	5.4
Auxiliary bishop	11.9
Bishops–New England	7.1
Bishops–Midwest	17.8
Bishops–Great Lakes	2.1
Bishops–Plains	0.0
Bishops–Southwest	0.0
Bishops–West	13.2
Priests taught in Catholic school	20.0
Priests never taught in Catholic school	30.5
Priests–top ten states	31.4
Other 40 states	19.5

Chi-square is significant at a level below .05

TABLE C32—The Diocese Should Make a Major Investment in Adult Religious Education Even if it Means Cutting Back on Schools

	BISHOPS AGREED %	PRIESTS AGREED %
10 and under	–	47.8
11–20	44.4	60.5
21–30	40.8	56.8
31–40	18.6	41.8
41 and over	26.6	28.1

Chi-square is significant at a level below .05

TABLE C33—The Diocese Should Make a Major Investment in Adult Religious Education Programs Even if it Means Cutting Back on Schools

ACTIVITY	AGREED %
Bishops Attended Catholic Elementary 5–8 years	23.0
Bishops Never Attended Catholic Elementary School	44.4
Bishops–New England	7.7
Bishops–Mideast	26.7
Bishops–Great Lakes	23.4
Bishops–Plains	32.1
Bishops–Southwest	20.0
Bishops–West	45.3
Priests Attended Catholic Secondary 3–4 years	46.8
Priests Never Attended Catholic Secondary School	58.8
Priests Taught in Catholic School	42.6
Priests Never Taught in Catholic School	53.4
Priests Principal of a Catholic School	32.3
Priest Never Principal of a Catholic School	51.2

For bishops' responses, chi-square is significant at a level below .05; for the priests, the chi-square probability level was 1.

TABLE C34—The Diocese Should Encourage New Catholic Schools With Lay Faculties

	AGREED %
Bishops–New England	75.0
Bishops–Mideast	50.0
Bishops–Great Lakes	65.2
Bishops–Plains	75.9
Bishops–Southwest	85.9
Bishops–West	79.2
Bishops–Top Ten States	62.9
Bishops–Other 40	78.6
Priests Pastor	58.5
Priests Associate	50.7
Priests Team	40.0
Priests Nonparish	56.1

For bishops, the chi-square is significant at a level below .05; for priests, the chi-square probability level was .1.

TABLE C35—The Diocese Should Encourage the Establishment of Catholic Schools in the Suburbs

YEARS ORDAINED	BISHOPS AGREED %	PRIESTS AGREED %
10 and under	–	56.9
11–20	66.6	49.4
21–30	82.4	56.9
31–40	90.5	72.8
41 and over	95.5	76.6

Chi-square is significant at a level below .05.

TABLE C36—The Diocese Should Encourage the Establishment of Catholic Schools in the Suburbs

	AGREED %
Bishops attended 5-8 years Catholic elementary school	90.7
Bishops never attended Catholic elementary	73.5

Chi-square is significant at a level below .05

Bishops in parish with school	88.7
Bishop never in parish with school	76.4

The chi-square probability level was .08

Priest taught in Catholic school	68.0
Priest never taught	56.4

Chi-square is significant at a level below .05

TABLE C37—Where There Is One School and Several Parishes, the School Should be Regionalized and All Parishes Have Some Responsibility for Financial Support

BISHOPS	AGREED %
New England	71.4
Mideast	97.7
Great Lakes	97.9
Plains	96.6
Southeast	96.7
West	94.3

Chi-square is significant at a level below .05

TABLE C38—It Would Be Better to Operate on a Regional Basis Fewer Catholic Schools Which Would Provide Better Quality

REGION	BISHOPS AGREED %	PRIESTS AGREED %
New England	50.0	88.2
Mideast	67.5	76.2
Great Lakes	68.9	80.8
Plains	25.0	46.2
Southeast	56.7	68.4
West	65.4	67.3

Chi square is significant at a level below .05

TABLE C39—It Would Be Better to Operate on a Regional Basis Fewer Catholic Schools Which Would Provide Better Quality

YEARS ORDAINED	AGREED %
10 and under	80.1
11–20	76.8
21–30	78.6
31–40	67.9
40 and over	46.6
YEARS IN PARISH WITH SCHOOL	
None	95.8
1–5	75.0
6–10	75.0
11 or more	67.1

Chi square is significant at a level below .05

TABLE C40—Bishops' Perceptions That Lay Teachers in Catholic Schools Have Improved the Quality of the Schools

ROLE	BISHOPS AGREED %
Diocesan Bishops	18.4
Auxiliary Bishops	34.8
TAUGHT IN CATHOLIC SCHOOL	
Yes	36.4
No	16.3

Chi-square is significant at a level below .05.

TABLE C41—Catholic Schools Must Give Greater Policy Control to Parents

YEARS IN PARISH WITH SCHOOL	BISHOPS AGREED %	PRIESTS AGREED %
None	88.2	47.8
1–5	55.7	53.8
6–10	71.7	29.2
11 or more	59.0	37.5

Chi-square is significant at a level below .05.

YEARS ATTENDED CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL	
None	27.3
1–2	50.0
3–4	42.7

The chi-square probability level was .06.

STATES	
Top Ten States	33.9
Other 40	48.3

Chi-square is significant at a level below .05.

TABLE C42—The Single Most Influential Person in the Structure of Parish School Management in Respondent's Diocese is the Pastor

YEARS IN PARISH WITH SCHOOL	BISHOPS AGREED %
None	56.3
1–5	56.7
6–10	67.3
11 or more	75.6

The chi-square probability level was .08

TABLE C43—The Single Most Influential Person in the Structure of Parish School Management in Respondent's Diocese is the Pastor

YEARS ORDAINED	PRIESTS AGREED %
10 and under	50.7
11–20	40.2
21–30	47.3
31–40	53.8
41 and over	76.7
MEMBER OF RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY	
Yes	35.6
No	54.0
STATES	
Top Ten States	44.8
Other 40	58.0

Chi-square for all of the above is significant at a level below .05.

PRINCIPAL OF CATHOLIC SCHOOL	
Yes	67.8
No	49.0

The chi-square probability level is .07

References

Augenstein, J. J. (1986). *Catholic high schools and their finances*. Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association.

Bryce, M. C. (1984). *Pride of place: The role of the bishops in the development of catechesis in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press.

Buetow, H. A. (1970). *Of singular benefit: The story of Catholic education in the United States*. New York: Macmillan.

Burns, J. A. (1912a). *Growth and development of the Catholic school system*. New York: Benzinger Brothers.

Burns, J. A. (1912b). *The principles, origin and establishment of the Catholic school system in the United States*. New York: Benzinger Brothers.

The Catholic high school: a national portrait. (1985). Washington: National Catholic Educational Associaiton.

Codex juris canonici. (1917) Citta del Vaticano: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis.

Code of canon law. (1983). Washington: Canon Law Society of America.

Curti, M. (1935). *The social ideas of American educators*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Dolan, J. P. (1985). *The American Catholic experience*. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday.

Ellis, J. T. (1969). *American Catholicism* (2nd ed.). Chicago: Univiersity of Chicago Press.

Databank historical data of the National Catholic Educational Association. (1986). Unpublished raw data.

Declaration on Christian education. (1965). In A. Flannery (Ed.), *Vatican Council II*. Northport, NY: Costello.

Ewens, M. (1978). *The role of the nun in nineteenth century America*. New York: Arno.

Five great encyclicals. (1939). New York: Paulist.

Fialka, J. J. (1986, May 19). U.S. nuns face crisis as more grow older with meager benefits. *The Wall Street Journal*, p. 1.

Flannery, A. (Ed.). (1975). *Vatican Council II*. Northport, NY: Costello.

Fogarty, G. P. (1985). *The Vatican and the American hierarchy*. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier.

Goebel, E. J. (1937). *A study of Catholic secondary education during the colonial period up to the first plenary council of Baltimore, 1852*. New York: Benzinger Brothers.

119

Good, C. V. (Ed.). (1959). *Dictionary of education* (2nd ed.). NY: McGraw-Hill.

Greeley, A. M. (1985). *American Catholics since the council: an unauthorized report*. Chicago: Thomas More.

Greeley, A. M. (1982). *Catholic high schools and minority students*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Greeley, A. M., McCready, W. C., & McCourt, K. (1976). *Catholic schools in a declining church*. Kansas City: Sheed & Ward.

Guilday, P. (1932). *A history of the councils of Baltimore (1791-1884)*. New York: Macmillan.

Hinkle, D. E., & Oliver, J. D. (1983). How large should the sample be? A question with no simple answer. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 43*, pp. 1051-1059.

Hochwalt, F. G. (1956). The Catholic school system in the United States. In L. J. Putz (Ed.), *The Catholic church, U.S.A.* (pp. 109-137). Chicago: Fides.

Hunt, T. C. (1979). Public schools and moral education: an American dilemma. *Religious Education, 79*, 350-372.

Hunt, T. C. (1981). The Bennett law of 1890: Focus on conflict between church and state. *Journal of Church and State, 23*, 69-93.

Iorizzo, L. J., & Mondello, S. (1971). *The Italian-Americans*. New York: Twayne Publications.

Iorizzo, L. J., & Mondello, S. (1980). *The Italian-Americans*. (rev. ed.). New York: Twayne Publications.

Kelly, F. D., Benson, P. L., & Donahue, M. J. (1986). *Toward effective parish religious education for children and young people*. Washington, D.C.: Natinal Catholic Educational Association.

Lazerson, M. (1977). Understanding American Catholic educational history. *History of Education Quarterly, 17*, 297-317.

McCluskey, N. G. (1964). *Catholic education in America: A documentary history*. Richmond, VA: William Byrd.

Meiring, B. J. (1978). *Educational aspects of the legislation of the councils of Baltimore 1829-1884*. New York: Arno.

National Catholic Educational Association. (1986). Data bank historical data. Unpublished manuscript.

Nolan, H. J. (Ed.). (1984). *Pastoral letters of the United States Catholic bishops*. (Vol 1). Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference.

O'Brien, J. S. (1985). Report on diocesan policies on teacher and administrator compensation. Unpublished manuscript.

O'Brien, J. S., & Vacca, R. S. (1974). *The supreme court and the religion-educatin controversy: a tightrope to entanglement*. Durham, NC: Moore.

The official Catholic directory. (1985). New York: P. J. Kennedy.

Reilly, D. F. (1944). *The school controversy, 1891-1893*. Washington: Catholic University Press.

Schipper, C. A. (1982). *A study of the perceptions of Catholic schools by diocesan priests of the Archdiocese of San Francisco*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of San Francisco.

Sullivan, E. P. (1981). *A study of the perceptions of Catholic schools by diocesan priests of the Archdiocese of Boston*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Boston College.

Teach them. (1976). Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference.

Thompson, A. D., & Hemrick, E. F. (1982). *The last fifteen years: a statistical survey of Catholic elementary and secondary formal religious education 1965-1980*. Washington, D.C. United States Catholic Conference.

To teach as Jesus did. (1972). Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference.

Tyack, D. B. (1974). *The one best system*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard.

United States Catholic elementary and secondary schools. 1984-1985. (1985). Washington: National Catholic Educational Association.

United States Catholic elementary and secondary schools. 1985-1986. (1986). Washington: National Catholic Educational Association.

United States Catholic elementary schools and their finances. (1986). Washington: National Catholic Educational Association.

United States Constitution. (1789).

TABLE OF CASES

Aguilar v. Felton, 739 F.2d 48, 105 S.Ct. 3232 (NY) (1985).

Board of Education v. Allen, 20 N.Y.(2d) 109, 228 N.E.(2d) 791, 392 U.S. 236, 88 S.Ct. 1923 (1968).

Cochran v. Louisiana State Board of Education, 169 La. 1030, 281 U.S. 370, 50 S.Ct. 335 (1930).

Committee for Public Education v. Reagan, 449 U.S. 646 (1980).

Committee for Public Education v. Nyquist, 350 F. Supp. 655, 413 U.S. 756, 93 S.Ct. 2955 (N.Y.) (1973).

Earley v. DiCenso, 316 F. Supp. 112, 403 U.S. 602 (Rhode Island) (1971).

Everson v. Board of Education of Ewing Township, 132 N.J.L. 98, 39A (2d) 75, 330 U.S. 1, 67 S.Ct. 504 (1947).

Grand Rapids School District v. Ball, 718 F.2d 1389, 105 S.Ct. 3216 (Michigan) (1985).

Hunt v. McNair, 258 S.C. 97, 187, S.W.(2d) 645, 413 U.S. 734, 93 S.Ct. 2868 (1973).

Lemon v. Kurtzman, 310 FSupp. 35, 403 U.S. 602 (Penn.) (1971).

Levitt v. Committee for Public Education, 342 F. Supp. 439, 413 U.S. 472, 93 S.Ct. 2814 (N.Y.) (1973).

Lynch v. Donnelly 104 S.Ct. 1355 (1984).
McCollum v. Board of Education, 71 N.E.(2d) 161, 333 U.S. 203, (Illinois) (1948).
Meek v. Pittenger, 374 FSupp. 629, 421 U.S. 349, 95 S.Ct. 1753 (Penn.) (1975).
Mueller v. Allen, 676 F.2d 1195, 463 U.S. 388, 103 S.Ct. 3062 (Minn.) (1983).
Pierce v. Society of Sisters, 296 Fed. 928, 268 U.S. 510, 45 45 S.Ct. 571 (Oregon) (1923).
Sloan v. Lemon, 340 FSupp. 1356, 413 U.S. 825, 93 S.Ct. 2982 (Penn.) (1973).
Tilton v. Richardson, 312 FSupp. 1191, 403 U.S. 672 (Conn.) (1971).
Waltz v. Tax Commission, 292 N.Y.S.(2d) 353, 246 N.E.(2d) 517, 397 U.S. 664, 90 S.Ct. 1409 (1970).
Wolman v. Essex, 342 FSupp. 399, 406 U.S. 912, 92 S.Ct. 1761 (Ohio) (1972).
Wolman v. Walter, 417 FSupp. 1113, 433 U.S. 229, 97 S.Ct. 2593 (Ohio) (1977).
Zorach v. Clauson, 303 N.Y. 161, 100 N.E.(2d) 463, 343 U.S. 306 72 S.Ct. 679 (1952).

VITA

John Stephen O'Brien was born in Portsmouth, Virginia, in 1940 and ordained to the ministerial priesthood in the Roman Catholic Church in 1965. He holds the following degrees: A.B. in Philosophy with a minor in Education (1961), and an S.T.L., Licentiate in Sacred Theology, (1965) from St. Mary's Seminary and University in Baltimore, Maryland; M.Ed. in the Teaching of English (1968) from the University of Virginia in Charlottesville; M.Ed. in Educational Administration (1972) from Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond; Ed.D. (1986) from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Blacksburg.

His professional experiences include: Executive Director, Department of Chief Administrators of Catholic Education, the National Catholic Educational Association in Washington, D.C.; Rector of the Cathedral of the Sacred Heart in Richmond, Virginia; Director of Christian Education for the Diocese of Richmond; Superintendent of Schools for the Diocese of Richmond; and various teaching and administrative positions in Catholic schools.

He has written two books, edited several, and written various articles in education and religious education.

National Catholic
Educational Association
1077 30th Street, N.W. Suite 100
Washington, D.C. 20007-3852
(202) 337-6232